DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 475 EA 025 920

AUTHOR	Cole, Ardra; And Others
TITLE	Years of Transition: Times for Change. A Review and Analysis of Pilot Projects Investigating Issues in the Transition Years. Volume Four: Exemplary Practices in the Transition Years: A Review of Research and Theory.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Ministry of Education and Training, Toronto.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-7778-1184-7
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	219p.; Report issued in four volumes and one appendix: volume 1 only also available in French, see EA 025 915-920.
AVAILABLE FROM	MGS Publications Services, 880 Bay Street, 5th Floor, Toronto, Ontario M7A 1N8, Canada (4 volume set: ISBN-0-7778-1180-4).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Information Analyses (070)
LANGUAGE	English; French
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Environment; Core Curriculum; *Educational Practices; Foreign Countries; Inservice Education; Integrated Curriculum; Junior High Schools; *School Administration; School Community Relationship; School Organization; *School Restructuring; *State Boards of Education; *Student Evaluation; *Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario; Student Support Services

ABSTRACT

When the Ontario (Canada) Ministry of Education launched the Transition Years initiatives, it argued that certain aspects of school practice deserved special attention: student assessment, recording, and reporting practices; teacher inservice education; school and classroom organization; school-community relationships; core curriculum; curriculum integration; and student support services. The chapters in this volume describe exemplary practices in each of these areas, and in school leadership. Chapters 1 through 8 provide a review of the English language literature. Chapters 9 through 15 written in French do the same with the French language literature. When equity is considered the dominant purpose for restructuring, "destreaming" (moving toward heterogeneous student grouping) becomes the focal means. However, destreaming only creates the potential for greater equity. Without radically rethinking classroom support, teachers' beliefs and skills, and student evaluation systems, the chances of achieving greater equity are remote. Substantial changes in these and other practices are crucial to success. Transformational leadership provides a sound focus for restructuring. Transformational school leaders can help staff develop and maintain a collaborative and professional school culture, create conditions favoring teacher development, and enhance the staff's collective and individual problem-solving capacities. (MLH)

ED

ED 371 475

Years of Transition: Times for Change

A Review and Analysis of Pilot Projects Investigating Issues in the Transition Years

Volume Four
Exemplary Practices in the Transition Years: A Review of Research and Theory

Editors
Kenneth Leithwood
Andy Hargreaves
Diane Gérin-Lajoie

Contributing Authors
Ardra Cole
Brad Cousins
Lorna Earl
Diane Gérin-Lajoie
Andy Hargreaves
Peter Joong
Kenneth Leithwood
Elizabeth Smyth
Dennis Thiessen

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. M. Hildebrand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA025980

Ministry of Education and Training
Ontario

This research project was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education and Training, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the ministry.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A RESEARCH STUDY COMMISSIONED BY THE ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Years of Transition: Times for Change

A Review and Analysis of Pilot Projects Investigating Issues in the Transition Years

Volume Four
Exemplary Practices in the Transition Years: A Review of Research and Theory

Editors:
Kenneth Leithwood
Andy Hargreaves
Diane Gérin-Lajoie

Contributing Authors:
Ardra Cole
Brad Cousins
Lorna Earl
Diane Gérin-Lajoie
Andy Hargreaves
Peter Joong
Kenneth Leithwood
Elizabeth Smyth
Dennis Thiessen

This research project was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education and Training, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

© QUEEN'S PRINTER FOR ONTARIO, 1993

Order Information:

MGS Publications Services
880 Bay Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

(416) 326-5300
(Toll Free) 1-800-668-9938

Order must be accompanied by a cheque or money order
payable to the Treasurer of Ontario

This report has been published in four volumes and one appendix. Volume One is available in French:

Volume One:	Context and Summary
Volume Two:	Explaining Variations in Progress
Volume Three:	The Realities of Restructuring: Case Studies of Transition
Volume Four:	Exemplary Practices in the Transition Years: A Review of Research and Theory

Technical Appendix to Volume Two

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Main entry under title:
Years of transition, times for change : a review and analysis of pilot projects investigating issues in the transition years

Includes some text in French.
Vol. 1 (Summary) issued also in French under title: Les années de transition, une époque de changement.
Contents: v. 1. Summary / principal investigators, Andy Hargreaves ... [et al.] – v. 2. Explaining variations in progress / principal investigators, Kenneth Leithwood, Brad Cousins, Diane Gérin-Lajoie – v. 3. The realitites of restructuring : case studies in transition / principal investigators, Andy Hargreaves, Diane Gérin-Lajoie, Dennis Thiessen – v. 4. Exemplary practices in the transition years : a review of research and theory / editors, Kenneth Leithwood, Andy Hargreaves, Diane Gérin-Lajoie.
ISBN 0-7778-1180-4 (4 v. set) ; ISBN 0778-1181-2 (v. 1) ; ISBN 0-7778-1182-0 (v. 2) ; ISBN 0-7778-1183-9 (v. 3) ; ISBN 0-7778-1184-7 (v. 4)

1. Articulation (Education)–Ontario. 2. Educational change–Ontario. 3. Middle school students–Ontario. I. Ontario. Ministry of Education and Training.

LB1623.Y42 1993 373.2'36 C93-092557-2

Contents

Preface ..... *v*
Vue d'ensemble de l'analyse des travaux de recherche en anglais ..... *viii*
Overview of the French Language Literature Review ..... *xiv*

Part 1: English Language Review

1. **Enhancing Classroom Assessment** 2
   Lorna Earl and Brad Cousins

2. **Inservice Education of Teachers (INSET): An Interpretive Review** 32
   Ardra Cole and Dennis Thiessen

3. **School Organization: How Should Students be Grouped for Instruction in the Transition Years?** 58
   Kenneth Leithwood

4. **School-Community Relationships** 80
   Kenneth Leithwood and Peter Joong

5. **Core Curriculum** 102
   Andy Hargreaves

6. **Curriculum Integration** 123
   Andy Hargreaves

7. **Student Support Services in the Transition Years** 139
   Elizabeth Smyth

8. **Conclusion: Leadership for Restructuring Schooling in the Transition Years** 154
   Kenneth Leithwood

Part 2: French Language Review
Diane Gérin-Lajoie

9. Les écoles de langue française 169

10. L'évaluation 171

11. La formation en cours d'emploi 177

12. Le soutien à l'élève 183

13. L'organisation scolaire 187

14. La participation de la collectivité 191

15. Le programme de base 196

Preface

When the Ontario Ministry of Education launched the Transition Years initiatives, it argued that six aspects of school practice deserved considerably more attention than others:

- Student assessment, recording and reporting practices;
- In-service education of teachers;
- School and classroom organization;
- School-community relationships;
- Core curriculum;
- Curriculum integration; and
- Student support services.

The chapters of this volume aim to describe exemplary practices in each of these areas, as well as in the area of school leadership. They do this by reviewing relevant research and theory. Chapters 1 through 8 provide such review of the English language literature; Chapters 9 through 15 do the same with the French language literature. And, although other reviews are available in the case of each area, Chapter 7 addresses an aspect of schools (Student Support Services) for which the Ministry itself had previously commissioned work. Chapter 7 is not intended to duplicate or replace the information provided by Making Connections (Levi & Ziegler, 1991). Rather, its purpose is to highlight additional evidence in which readers may be interested, there being virtually no overlap in the sources used in the two reviews.

Why should we be preoccupied with the six aspects of schools which constitute the focus of all but one of these chapters? Obviously, one reason is that the Ministry requested this focus: "those who pay the piper call the tune". A second reason, one of several most likely lying behind the Ministry's request, is that many other restructuring initiatives underway in developed countries at the present time have similar preoccupations: there is a kind of informal consensus that making changes in these seven areas of school practice will contribute significantly to some valued policy goals. Although not yet clearly enunciated in Ontario, there is a reasonableness to this claim when viewed from the perspective of one goal, equity,

that many restructuring initiatives hold in common. When equity is considered the dominant purpose for restructuring, "destreaming" becomes the focal means: as argued in Chapter 3, the positive effects of almost all types of streaming or homogeneous student grouping practices are negligible while the consequences for equity of access to knowledge are significantly negative.

Destreaming by itself, however, only creates the *potential* for greater equity: without radically rethinking, for example, the kinds of differential support a heterogeneous group of students will need, the skills and beliefs their teachers must possess and how those students will be evaluated, the chances of actually *achieving* greater equity optimistically could be described as remote. Destreaming is a necessary but not sufficient part of restructuring efforts aimed at equity. Substantial changes in at least those other areas of practice reviewed in this volume will be crucial to making progress with the equity goal as schools begin to destream.

Changes in areas of practice reviewed in this volume are by no means the only changes likely to confront schools, however. Previous failed reform efforts have sensitized us to the damage that can be inflicted on those promising classroom organization, curricular and instructional changes that directly effect students' experiences in school ("first-order" changes) by failure to redesign other aspects of the school system (to make "second-order" changes) in support. Teacher supervision, board-wide testing and budget allocation procedures are examples of areas ripe for redesign as part of second-order changes that often will be important to undertake. Hargreaves et al (1992) have identified a number of such changes needed to support destreaming initiatives in Ontario secondary schools. Simply put, then, there are considerable bodies of knowledge beyond those reviewed between these covers that are highly relevant to Transition Years initiatives, not the least of which is knowledge about processes for change - as distinct from the content of change.

Convincing ourselves that there are good reasons to be preoccupied about aspects of school included in these reviews still leaves unanswered questions of knowledge use. What use is to be made of the knowledge included in these chapters? It is not a straightforward question to answer. This knowledge is of a type which Lindblom and Cohen (1979) have called "professional social inquiry" knowledge (PSI) - the results of systematically conducted research - and it is but one of several types of knowledge available to those undertaking Transition Years initiatives. "Ordinary

knowledge" is another: relatively voluminous, as compared with PSI, ordinary knowledge is the product of common sense, casual trial and error and thoughtful reflection. People rely heavily on such knowledge for social problems and PSI is probably, at best, a modest supplement. Furthermore, PSI is a supplement most often in the sense of verifying claims found within ordinary knowledge rather than providing dramatic new insights, although this occurs occasionally.

By this point you probably understand the direction in which this line of reasoning takes us. While much more could be said, this is enough to help clarify what are the realistic expectations for use of the knowledge presented in subsequent chapters: food for thought; something off which to bounce your "ordinary knowledge"; possible clarification of concepts that may be confusing you; a bit of disconfirmation for other hunches - definitely not prescriptions for practice. But useful.

Kenneth Leithwood
Editor

References

Hargreaves, A., Davis, J., Fullan, M., Wignall, R., Stager, M., & Macmillan, R. (1992). *Secondary school work cultures and educational change*. Toronto: OISE, mimeo.

Levi, M., & Ziegler, S. (1991). *Making connections: Guidance and career education in the Middle Years*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Lindblom, C., & Cohen, D. (1979). *Usable knowledge*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Vue d'ensemble de l'analyse des travaux de recherche en anglais

1. L'amélioration de l'évaluation en salle de classe
(Lorna Earl et Brad Cousins)

Ce chapitre fait état d'une recherche récente qui portait sur l'évaluation en salle de classe et sur les répercussions sur les éducateurs et éducatrices. Il contient un sommaire de cinq points de vue : la nature de l'évaluation; les conséquences de l'évaluation en salle de classe; l'enseignante ou l'enseignant comme évaluateur ou évaluatrice; la culture, la politique et la démarche à suivre; les méthodes valables d'évaluation en salle de classe.

Une bonne évaluation en salle de classe est flexible et ouverte, et n'est ni rigide ni secrète. Bien qu'il y ait beaucoup de discussion sur le «pourquoi», le «quoi» et le «comment», il existe six principes fondamentaux de mesure ainsi que des lignes directrices de contrôle de qualité que l'on devrait appliquer à toute évaluation des élèves, et qui devraient être évidents dans les méthodes d'évaluation en salle de classe.

Les besoins en formation se manifestent dans les domaines suivants : la planification et la mise au point des tests; l'emploi des méthodes d'évaluation informelle; l'emploi des résultats d'évaluation pour la planification de l'enseignement et de l'évaluation formative; l'emploi des résultats d'évaluation pour l'évaluation sommative; l'administration et l'évaluation des procédés d'évaluation; le choix et l'emploi de tests publiés et les principes de mesure.

2. La formation en cours d'emploi des enseignantes et enseignants : une étude interprétative
(Ardra Cole et Dennis Thiessen)

Ce chapitre comprend une vue d'ensemble des méthodes de formation; un sommaire des lignes directrices pour une bonne formation; une étude des nouvelles optiques en formation et un énoncé sur le rapport entre cette étude et le projet des années de transition.

L'école est l'endroit le plus favorable à la formation, et les enseignantes et enseignants tiennent un rôle de leadership plus important. La formation se faisant à l'école et sous la supervision des enseignantes et enseignants, cinq thèmes intimement liés ressortiront : la collaboration, l'intégration, la réflexion, l'expérience et l'enquête. Les composantes cruciales des approches ayant fait leurs preuves par le passé restent les mêmes : Il s'agit de l'engagement des enseignantes et enseignants, de l'appui collégial et structural, et du pouvoir d'adapter de nouvelles méthodes. Quand la formation est faite à partir de l'école et centrée

sur le personnel enseignant, les enseignantes et enseignants ont moins de mal à bien assimiler les méthodes d'enseignement puisque la frontière entre l'enseignement et l'apprentissage des méthodes se confondent.

3. L'organisation de l'école : comment regrouper les élèves pour l'enseignement dans les années de transition
(Kenneth Leithwood)

La recherche vise quatre points :

1. dans quelle mesure les élèves sont regroupés par habiletés durant les années de transition et pourquoi ils le sont;

2. les formes typiques de regroupement par habileté et les effets des différentes formes sur les élèves;

3. l'explication de ces effets sur les élèves;

4. les répercussions de la recherche dans le domaine du regroupement des élèves sur les méthodes d'enseignement durant les années de transition.

Le regroupement homogène par habileté des élèves dans les années de transition est fréquent. Cette fréquence s'explique par : a) l'opinion courante selon laquelle le regroupement par habileté permet un enseignement mieux ciblé; b) les principes et méthodes éducatives traditionnels de la majorité des enseignantes et enseignants; et c) l'utilité du regroupement par habileté pour encourager l'épanouissement de l'élève malgré les conditions imparfaites qui prévalent dans les salles de classe et les écoles.

Ce sont probablement les élèves aux habilités scolaires supérieures qui bénéficient le plus du regroupement homogène par habileté. Cependant, les avantages qu'ils en retirent demeurent très modérés. D'autres élèves pourraient bénéficier d'un regroupement très limité par habileté et à l'intérieur de la même salle de classe, surtout en mathématiques et peut-être en lecture. Mais la participation à un groupe hétérogène pour la plus grande partie de leur temps est probablement ce qu'il y a de mieux pour les élèves. Le regroupement par habileté doit se dérouler dans des conditions qui : a) réduisent l'hétérogénéité dans l'habileté particulière enseignée; b) comprennent une réévaluation fréquente et permettent une certaine souplesse dans la formation de groupes; et c) adaptent le rythme de l'enseignement aux capacités d'apprentissage des élèves.

Les effets vraiment différents du regroupement homogène par habileté qu'ont ressenti les groupes d'élèves d'habileté supérieure et inférieure peuvent s'expliquer dans le contexte de la définition de Murphy et Hallinger (1989, p.130). Selon cette définition, on ne peut pas atteindre l'équité en assurant simplement que tous les élèves reçoivent le même enseignement,

le même niveau de ressources, etc. Certains élèves ont des besoins particuliers; d'autres ont de plus grands besoins. Cet argument favorise la différentiation de l'expérience scolaire pour atteindre l'équité, le même argument employé pour défendre le regroupement homogène par habileté.

On propose six changements de premier ordre :

1. Les écoles devront adopter comme norme le regroupement hétérogène des élèves.

2. Le regroupement homogène par habileté, s'il est employé, devra être limité.

3. Le cas échéant, il faudra toutefois mettre au point des méthodes pour créer des groupes homogènes.

4. Il faudra prévoir des mesures spécifiques, surtout pour les groupes d'élèves d'habileté inférieure.

5. Il faudra apporter une aide significative aux enseignantes et enseignants responsables des classes dont la gamme d'habiletés des élèves est variée.

6. Il faudra donner aux enseignantes et enseignants une formation spéciale quant aux stratégies d'enseignement élaborées spécifiquement pour les groupes hétérogènes.

On propose trois changements de deuxième ordre :

7. Les écoles devront planifier l'introduction progressive et systématique d'une gamme d'innovations « techniques » qui se retrouvent en grande mesure dans les initiatives des années de transition.

8. Les écoles devront amener certains enseignantes et enseignants, administratrices et administrateurs et parents à réviser leurs attitudes si on veut réussir le décloisonnement.

9. Les écoles devront développer ou maintenir des cultures de travail coopératif qui permettent de partager les risques associés au changement de méthodes et qui favorisent la résolution de problèmes en groupe.

4. Les rapports entre l'école et la communauté
(Kenneth Leighwood et Peter Joong)

On étudie sept types de partenariat entre l'école et le foyer :

1. L'école devrait aider les parents à développer leurs habiletés parentales et encourager ceux-ci à créer au foyer des conditions propices à l'apprentissage.

2. L'école devrait proposer aux parents des techniques pour les aider à recréer un environnement d'apprentissage à la maison.

3. L'école devrait assurer l'accès et la coordination des services communautaires et de soutien aux enfants et aux familles.

4. L'école devrait tout mettre en œuvre pour favoriser une communication claire et réciproque avec la famille au sujet des programmes de l'école et des progrès de l'élève.

5. L'école devrait donner aux parents l'occasion de jouer un rôle d'appui à l'école, après avoir fourni une formation appropriée.

6. L'école devrait appuyer les parents en tant que preneurs de décision et développer leurs capacités de leadership dans les rôles de gestion scolaire, de consultation et de défense des intérêts des écoles dans la communauté.

7. L'école devrait se servir des ressources communautaires et chercher des occasions pour renforcer le programme scolaire.

Le développement de liens étroits avec les parents permettra de mieux répondre aux besoins des élèves dans les années de transition. Pour plusieurs élèves, cette période de leur vie est à la fois source de défi et de confusion. La pression qu'exercent les autres adolescents pour faire partie d'une culture unique entre en conflit avec le besoin qu'a l'élève de se préparer aux multiples dimensions de sa vie d'adulte. On ne peut pas compartimenter les intérêts sociaux et intellectuels d'une personne; il faut plutôt coordonner les services de soutien qui lui sont offerts. Dans un tel contexte, il est crucial que le soutien que les adolescents reçoivent des adultes dans leur vie soit cohérent et fiable. Les adolescents profiteront de la création de liens entre l'école et la famille, fondés sur le travail de collaboration, pour atteindre leurs buts durant cette période de leur vie.

5. Le programme de base
(Andy Hargreaves)

Un programme de base peut prendre plusieurs formes et peut être élaboré selon plusieurs critères. Pour faciliter le passage et l'adaptation des élèves à l'école secondaire, on devrait

avoir un programme commun qui viserait une vaste gamme de résultats d'apprentissage. Pour cela, il serait bon d'organiser le programme autour de grands champs d'expérience éducative plutôt qu'autour de matières spécifiques. Les conseillères et conseillers pédagogiques du conseil scolaire pourraient travailler de concert avec de petits groupes d'écoles pour les aider à suivre ces grandes lignes de conduite et veiller à ce qu'ils le fassent vraiment.

Un programme de base de ce type pourrait prévenir et même contrecarrer les effets démotivants du programme scolaire axé sur les matières. Il pourrait aussi permettre aux écoles et aux enseignantes et enseignants d'élaborer le contenu de leur propre programme : on créerait ainsi une culture d'enseignantes et d'enseignants qui seraient engagés dans le changement et l'amélioration. Ce genre de programme de base, élaboré localement d'après un cadre général, offre une occasion importante de supplanter les modèles traditionnels d'élaboration de programmes imposés et basés dans l'école – modèles qui jusqu'à présent n'ont pas réussi à briser la domination de l'enseignement théorique sur le programme scolaire du secondaire.

6. L'intégration des programmes
(Andy Hargreaves)

Cette analyse fait ressortir les responsabilités qui pourraient incomber à ceux et celles qui s'engagent dans l'intégration des programmes. En particulier :

- Il faut définir clairement le mot «intégration». L'imprécision peut être source de frustrations, une fois passés les engagements initiaux.
- Il est important de donner une définition précise de l'intégration, que sous-tendent de grands principes, et non pas d'évoquer des thèmes vagues.
- L'intégration prend plusieurs formes. Elles ne mènent pas toutes au progrès ni à l'amélioration. L'intégration peut être bonne ou mauvaise.
- Puisqu'il y a plusieurs formes d'intégration possibles, les valeurs qui influencent le choix de l'école devraient être mises en évidence pour que les buts de cette intégration soient clairs.
- La mise en œuvre de l'intégration devrait être gérée selon des modèles qui tiennent compte de sa complexité.
- Il faut aborder l'intégration et ses difficultés de mise en œuvre avec réalisme et conviction.

7. Les services de soutien à l'élève dans les années de transition
(Elizabeth Smyth)

Ce chapitre porte sur quatre séries de questions à considérer pour offrir des services de soutien efficaces qui devraient aider les élèves à acquérir les connaissances et les habiletés qui leur seront utiles dans leur vie personnelle, leur avenir académique, et leurs possibilités de carrière.

La documentation sur la prestation des services de soutien aux jeunes adolescents est riche. Tous les intervenants et intervenantes s'entendent pour dire qu'un bon programme est un programme qui répond aux besoins des apprenants adolescents. Il y a moins de matériel expliquant comment faire la mise en œuvre de ces programmes, l'intégration des services dans le programme scolaire régulier, la formation des enseignantes et enseignants et des conseillères et conseillers qui fourniront de tels programmes et services, et l'évaluation de ces programmes et services. Il est alors essentiel de consulter la documentation sur la mise en œuvre des programmes et sur le changement scolaire pour élaborer des critères visant à évaluer l'efficacité des services de soutien à l'élève dans les années de transition.

8. Conclusion : Le leadership pour une refonte de la scolarisation dans les années de transition
(Kenneth Leithwood)

Dans ce chapitre, l'auteur propose un modèle de leadership transformationnel applicable à l'administration des écoles pour les années 1990. Les résultats d'une étude dans certaines écoles suggèrent que les leaders transformationnels poursuivent trois buts fondamentaux de façon plus ou moins continue :

- aider le personnel à créer et à maintenir un milieu professionnel et coopératif à l'école;
- créer des conditions motivantes et offrir des occasions de perfectionnement aux enseignantes et enseignants;
- améliorer les habiletés du personnel à résoudre des problèmes ensemble et individuellement.

En somme, le leadership transformationnel en éducation n'a pas encore fait toutes ses preuves mais on peut dire que jusqu'ici, il semble entraîner des effets positifs; ce type de leadership devrait retenir davantage d'attention au cours de la refonte scolaire dans les années de transition.

Les chapitres 9 à 15 sont publiés en français.

9. French-language schools

The French language review is a survey of empirical rather than theoretical research, firstly, because most of the research on franco-ontarian education has been empirical and, secondly, so as not to repeat the analysis of the literature presented in the preceding chapters of this volume. The conceptual framework of educational research in both English and French is in most cases, the same. The study focuses on the experience of the last ten years of minority French-language education. While the area of major interest is the Transition Years, some of the studies touch on Specialisation Years issues.

10. Evaluation

This chapter reviews the literature evaluation of programs, of teaching materials, of teachers and of students. Student evaluation is discussed under the headings: standardized tests and summative evaluation, and individualized formative evaluation.

11. In-service training

Minority status, distance, and cultural mission are some of the unique elements relating to in-service training in the French language. These special needs have been noted by the Ministry of Education and have resulted in specific in-service projects. It is important to recognize the work already accomplished in this area and to envisage programs initiated by the teachers themselves.

12. Student support

The drop-out rate is deemed to be in direct relation to the support services that schools should provide. The drop-out rate among Francophone students is higher than the provincial average. There is a wide disparity between the educational goals of francophone students and the achievement of these goals. Several programmes designed to improve this situation are proposed.

13. School organization

This chapter looks at the microstructure of the school and the ways in which school organization influences the relations among the various participants and stakeholders. When the innovative projects under way in the schools of the province are analyzed, it becomes evident that in order to succeed, projects that involve a complete restructuring of their organization must provide a support system for all the participants: students, teachers, administrators and support staff. The authors note that very little documentation exists on

school organization in relation to French-language schools in Ontario and suggest that more research should be conducted in this area.

14. Community involvement

French-language schools in Ontario play an important role in the survival of the linguistic community. The school is often the focus of community and cultural activities. The community is therefore called upon to become involved in everything that touches French-language education be it on the level of governance or on the level of the functioning of the school. In some regions of the province, school-community centres are being developed to include social services, health services, recreational activities, a public library, day-care and literacy programs. No research has been done on school-community relations specific to the transition years.

15. Core curriculum

Other than in the Français program, curriculum guidelines for programmes offered in French-language schools are based on the guidelines prepared for English-language schools. Little has been done to attempt to reflect the franco-ontarian reality in existing school programs although more and more teaching materials are being developed and published in French in the province. Certain materials have been developed which emphasize the teaching of language as a subject and the use of language across the entire program as well as creating links with the community.

Part 1:

English Language Review

1.

ENHANCING CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT

Lorna Earl and Brad Cousins

> The assessments that drive student learning and academic self-concept are those used in classrooms. (Stiggins, 1990)

This chapter is about the 99% of assessments that occur in classrooms on a daily basis. It is not about "national or international indicators" or "provincial accountability programs". Although large scale studies for public accountability are high profile and perhaps necessary, they are not the assessments that make a difference for the students in classrooms. Classroom assessment is the kind of assessment that is an integral part of classroom activity. It includes such things as oral questioning, teacher-made tests, portfolios, assignments and observations of performance. These kinds of activities occur frequently, may be formal or informal, and form the basis for many decisions that are made by teachers, students, and parents.

A decade long task analysis of classroom assessment (Stiggins, 1989) revealed that teachers typically spend a third or more of their professional time involved in assessment-related activities. Anderson (1989) reported that "testing" was the most frequent classroom activity in grade 4 and 7 science classrooms in British Columbia, more frequent than conducting science demonstrations, using the computer, student experiments, or doing homework. Although Wilson (1989) found considerable variability in assessment frequency from course to course in the Ontario high school that he studied, a student carrying a full program of 3 or 4 courses experienced some type of formal evaluation activity approximately every second day of school.

Teachers use assessments continually to influence the learning experiences provided to students (Stiggins, Conklin et al., in press). By the time a student reaches the intermediate division, marks or grades are determined substantially by teacher-made tests (McLean, 1985) and teacher tests receive the most emphasis in the determination of student achievement (Anderson, 1989). Teachers rely on their

own classroom assessments as the primary source of information about student achievement (Stiggins, Conklin & Bridgeford, 1986) and prefer to develop their own assessments (Stiggins, 1988). Ironically, the assessment that goes on most frequently is the one that has been studied least (Wilson, 1992). While there has been extensive research for over 25 years on the impact of standardized testing on students, there has been little research until recently dedicated to the study of the kind of assessment that takes place daily in schools and classrooms; assessment that can have substantial educational and psychological effects on students; assessment that can form the basis for decisions that can change the course of students' lives.

This chapter is a review of recent research that describes what is known about classroom assessment and the implication of that knowledge for educators. It begins with a description of our methods for selecting studies for the review and a brief discussion of the methodological characteristics of the studies. We then summarizes what is known about classroom assessment from five perspectives: the nature of assessment; the consequences of classroom assessment; teacher as assessor; culture, policy, and procedures; and effective classroom assessment practices. Finally, we offer implications for staff development in classroom assessment practices. While we rely heavily on original empirical research, reference is also made to existing reviews of relevant research (e.g., Crooks, 1988; Hoge & Coladaci, 1989; MacIver, 1989; Natriello, 1987; Rogers, 1991; Spafkin, 1980; Stiggins, 1988).

METHOD

The articles for review were located through: 1) a computer search of the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) database conducted for the period 1980 to present, 2) bibliographic followup from articles, 3) research reviews mentioned above, 4) the authors' personal files, and 5) correspondence with researchers working in this area around the world.

Methodological Characteristics of the Studies

The studies were reviewed with attention to: size and composition of the sample; location; study design; instruments; and, dependent and independent variables. Over half of the studies were conducted within the past three years,

suggesting the increasing importance of classroom assessment issues. Respondents in a majority of the studies were elementary and/or secondary school teachers (60%) and students provided data in about a third of the studies. In a few cases other sources of data were used such as principals, district decision makers, and college of education staff. Sample size varied depending on the design of the studies; from case study to large scale assessments and surveys involving tens of thousands of respondents. The majority of the studies were carried out in the United States, although a large number (about one third) were conducted in the Canadian context.

Study design varied considerably as well. Many were retrospective in orientation and were cross-sectional surveys of current practice and opinions. A substantial proportion (30%) occurred over time (longitudinal), and a few used quasi-experimental design in order to test causal relationships (e.g., Cousins, Ross and Prentice, in press; Dassa, 1990; Slavin, 1980). Others used case study methods to investigate classroom assessment practices and effects (e.g., Smith 1991; Stiggins, Frisbie & Griswold, 1989; Wilson, 1989). The studies included data gathered through standardized tests, questionnaires, checklists, logs of classroom practice, and naturalistic observation, with considerable variation over, as well as within, studies.

Most studies (two thirds) examined current classroom assessment practice, including teacher beliefs (e.g., Smith, 1991), use of student data (Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Fetler, 1982), frequency of testing, and methods of student evaluation (e.g., Anderson, 1989; Crooks, 1988; Traub, Nagy, MacRury & Klaiman, 1988; Wilson, 1989; 1990). About one third of the studies reported effects on students in terms of student perceptions and beliefs (e.g., Paris, Lawton, Turner & Roth, 1991); student performance and achievement (e.g., Oregon Department of Education, 1989; Slavin, 1980); and, cognitive and affective outcome variables (Dassa, 1990). Although claims for causal relationships and linkages were generally weak or heavily qualified, some authors attempted to differentiate effects of assessment practice on the basis of variables such as grade level (e.g., Salmon-Cox, 1981; Bateson, 1990), test type (e.g., Dorr-Bremme, 1983), teacher knowledge and beliefs (e.g., Gullickson, 1984; Wilson, 1989), and subject area (e.g., Egan and Archer, 1985; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

The wide array of research methods observed in our sample is testament to the state of the art in classroom assessment research. The bulk of the research provides

a description of current classroom assessment practice. Studies that provide "hard" research evidence, about what effective evaluation practice looks like or about causal relationships are rare. Because researchers have only recently focused on classroom assessment, our knowledge about the impact of various assessment strategies, about effective practice, and about how teachers can improve their practices is still very limited. We have attempted to describe what is known from empirical work but often have had to rely on conjecture and extrapolation from research findings to provide suggestions for teachers. Classroom assessment, however, is sufficiently important as a component of the instructional process that we have taken a step beyond the empirical studies to offer a glimpse of practices that appear to be promising.

NATURE OF CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT

Although this is a relatively new field of study, the recent work of a few researchers is beginning to provide rich descriptions of the nature of classroom assessment practices. We have summarized the literature related to current practice in the following categories:

(1) purposes for assessment;
(2) what is evaluated (e.g., content, criteria and standards);
(3) assessment methods (e.g., frequency, type of assessment); and
(4) reporting and follow-up to assessment (e.g., communication to students, reporting to parents).

Purposes for Assessment

One distinguishing feature of classroom assessment is that it is multi-faceted and serves many different purposes. Although almost any curriculum document addresses the need to identify objectives or outcomes and ensure that assessment is consistent with these statements, it is paradoxical that there has been little theoretical or empirical analysis of the purposes of classroom assessment (Natriello, 1987). This gap is particularly disconcerting because assessment is one of the most complex and important tasks teachers undertake as they routinely try to consider all of the information about their students in order to make a wide range of decisions (Stiggins, et al, 1986). Although the literature about purposes remains scant, there

are many lists or descriptions of the stated purposes of classroom assessment. In this section, we itemize these purposes and describe what little research is available about how each purpose is actually evident in classrooms.

Classroom assessment is used for *instructional purposes*. Teachers assess students to discover what they already know and to make decisions about what to teach and to whom (Stiggins, 1991). Teachers use the results of classroom assessment activities to diagnose - to examine and analyze the nature and circumstances of strengths and weaknesses for specific students and to gain a detailed understanding of the way in which a particular student understands or fails to understand what is being taught. The process of evaluating student performance can, in itself, provide opportunities for practising skills and consolidating learning (Crooks, 1988). Teachers also use the results of classroom assessment to evaluate their own program and instruction - to provide direction for improvement and adjustment to a program for individual students or groups of students (Hymes, 1991).

Placement, promotion and certification form another set of purposes for classroom assessment (Natriello, 1987; Hargreaves & Earl, 1990). Results from classroom assessment are translated into anecdotal comments, marks, grades, or diplomas that are designed to provide information about a student's level of accomplishment or mastery. Teachers, administrators, and a variety of other users consider this information when making decisions about such things as program alternatives, promotion to the next grade, admission to post-secondary institutions or hiring for employment. In some of these instances, classroom assessment is a major component in the decision-making and in others it represents a small piece. McLean (1985) found that high school marks, as determined by classroom assessment, play an important role in university admissions in Canadian provinces, contributing from 50-100% of the information on which the decision is based. The same study found that there was not a strong interest in high school marks as a criterion for hiring by employers.

Communicating to parents and to students is perhaps the most obvious purpose of classroom assessment. Teachers use their classroom assessments to focus attention on what is important in the program (Natriello, 1987; Crooks, 1988) and to provide information about individual students performance in school to the students and their parents/guardians (Natriello, 1987). This communication can be

in the form of comments, grades or marks on a formal report card, or more informal descriptions of progress, samples of work, portfolios, etc.. Parents use the information they receive from teachers to set expectations for their child and to decide how to help at home (Stiggins, 1990). Students also use the information. It provides them with a basis for setting personal goals and establishing their relationship with peers and teachers (Stiggins, 1990).

Classroom assessment activities are often used as *motivational activities* designed to ensure that students are willing to commit the effort necessary to perform the task. Teachers believe that the process, product, and feedback from classroom assessment can encourage students and enhance their self esteem by providing evidence of their progress and success and by identifying places where their efforts will pay off (Crooks, 1988).

Although it is less often stated as a purpose for classroom assessment, some research suggests that classroom assessment is also used as a *control vehicle* (Stiggins, 1990). The nature, timing and importance of assessment activities are used to reward or punish students and encourage compliance.

In the final analysis, a reported overall aim of classroom assessment is to *produce individuals who realistically evaluate themselves and their actions.* Costa (1989) stated this purpose succinctly: "we must constantly remind ourselves that the ultimate purpose of evaluation is to enable students to evaluate themselves... Fostering students' ability to direct and redirect themselves must be a major goal - or what is education for" (p.3).

All of these purposes are potentially reflected in classroom assessment practices. It is apparent that teachers think a great deal about evaluation (Wilson, Rees & Connock, 1989) and use their assessment activities for instructional purposes (Rogers, 1991) as well as for generating marks for a final summary assessment (Wilson, 1989). However, this range of purposes can create conflicting practices for teachers. Even though many teachers report that evaluation is a major component of instruction, Wilson (1992) found that teachers (especially from grade 4 through high school) engaged in evaluation practices that aimed primarily at producing defensible marks for reporting purposes and that the uses of evaluation for reporting, control, and prediction purposes are more highly rated than those that

relate to improving the teaching-learning process (Wilson, 1992). This conflict is reinforced by Wolf, LeMahieu and Eresh. (1992) who stated "assessment has been driven too exclusively by concerns for measuring and reporting achievement data for outside audiences. Often forgotten is the equally important work of encouraging students, teachers and families to think hard about what is worth knowing and then making sure students know it" (p.10).

Perhaps the most important issue that arises from the investigation of the many purposes of classroom assessment is the complexity that it uncovers. Some of the purposes are clinical and responsive, others are directed at making decisions and they sometimes compete with one another. It becomes clear that the same assessment approach cannot serve all of the purposes equally well. As Haney (1991) suggests, it is essential that we clearly identify the various functions of assessing student performance and fit our assessments to these functions. When tests or assessment procedures are used for different purposes, they have very different characteristics. Trying to use one assessment procedure for a wide range of purposes is like trying to "use a hammer for jobs ranging from brain surgery to pile-driving" (Haney, 1991, p.144). Multiple purposes require a wide variety of approaches and strategies.

What is Evaluated?

The simple answer to the question 'what do we evaluate?' is 'we evaluate what we teach'. This seemingly straightforward statement becomes more complex amidst the current debate about what really matters in schools. There are heated arguments about what matters, about what should be taught and about the expectations we ought to hold for the students in our schools. Consequently, there is disagreement about what should be evaluated. These discussions about what future citizens will need to know and be able to do to be successful in a rapidly changing society will undoubtedly continue for some time. In virtually every case, however, the portrait of valued outcomes that is emerging, is far more complex than had been previously recognized (Stiggins, in press).

It is in this context that we have examined the available research on what teachers evaluate. For several decades curriculum has been structured using classification schemes like Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives

(cognitive, affective and psychomotor) or Pratt's (1991) framework for objectives (knowledge, skill, somatic, attitudinal, expressive, and experiential). Although these classification systems include a wide range of outcomes for students in many domains, most classroom assessment continues to focus on the cognitive domain. When researchers have analyzed samples of teacher-made tests, they have found that the majority of the questions assess low level cognitive knowledge of terms, facts, rules, and principles but very few assess behaviours that would be classified as requiring higher order skills like application, synthesis or evaluation (Crooks, 1988; Stiggins et al., 1989; Fleming & Chambers, 1983). In Canadian studies, Rogers (1991) and Bateson (1990) observed that most classroom assessment activities focus on lower order thinking skills (e.g., knowledge, recall) and place relatively little emphasis on other higher order thinking skills or affective qualities evident in provincial goals for education.

Evaluation in non-academic areas continues to pose problems for teachers. It seems likely that teachers have always considered non-academic dimensions in evaluating their students. Airaisian (1984) identified two sets of characteristics that are measured in classrooms (scholastic variables and social/personal variables) and Salmon-Cox (1981) noted that the relative importance assigned to these two factors varied with grade level. The higher the grade level the more importance was attached to the academic dimension. The non-academic components have tended not to be evaluated separately, but form part of the overall evaluative judgment of the teacher (R. J. Wilson, personal communication, October 21, 1991). Although there is agreement that dimensions other than academic achievement enter into the evaluation process in schools and classrooms, there is less agreement about which of these criteria (e.g., participation, effort, conduct) may be appropriate (Natriello, 1987) or about how to assess or communicate them.

As our knowledge of human development and learning increases, and as the demands of the contemporary society change, curriculum and instruction is also changing. Instruction in many classrooms now includes such things as cooperative group learning, attention to learning styles, a recognition of multiple intelligences, and a focus on higher order thinking and problem solving. These changes in instruction have resulted in a recognition of the need for changes in evaluation practices as well. As Stiggins (in press) states: "the majority of the educational outcomes that we value for students cannot be translated into objective paper and

pencil test items". Educators have begun to see the need for alternative assessment practices and have recognized that fundamental changes in instruction depend on reform in the assessment of student performance (Linn, Baker & Dunbar, 1991; Shepard, 1991a). Performance assessment is becoming one important vehicle for providing a more complete picture of student achievement (Stiggins, in press; Hymes, 1991; Wolf, LeMahieu & Eresh, 1992).

There is an additional complication in the issue of what is evaluated, in that the important outcomes in the curriculum (e.g., reading, writing, thinking, problem-solving) are often quite complex and require many steps. Evaluating them is not a simple activity and it changes across the grades. Even the evaluation of subject-based content is not a simple task. Teachers need to decide what is important to assess, how to assess it, and what criteria and standards to use. There is a general expectation that teachers will share an understanding of the criteria and the standards that should be used at different stages to assess their students. A number of studies in Ontario have shown that this kind of consistency does not necessarily exist (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1988; Traub et al., 1988). In fact, it is difficult to get agreement about the criteria and standards that define the level of achievement that students are supposed to achieve. Setting standards is, perhaps, the central issue in a struggle to accommodate universal expectations and individual accomplishments in a single system. Observations of classroom practices reveal three types of standards that teachers use: those set in reference to the performance of some group (norm-referenced); those set in reference to some pre-determined criterion or expectation (criterion-referenced or outcome-referenced); and, those set in reference to the previous performance level of an individual (self-referenced). Traditional testing has rested on a norm-referenced set of standards and has been based on the premise that the performance of students will be distributed on a bell-shaped curve. With norm-referenced standards, a student's performance is compared to other students (in the class, school, province, etc.) When standards are outcome-referenced, assessment is aligned with beliefs about what students ought to be able to do and with curriculum objectives and instruction. This kind of standard necessitates a clear understanding about expectations. Self-referenced assessment shows changes in relation to a student's own performance at different points in time and is often very idiosyncratic. Each of these reference points is legitimate and teachers use all three at different times and in combination. As Wilson (personal communication, October 21, 1991) has observed, the three standards "actually exist as

a kind of stew" that he calls "content-referenced, group performance" and the distinctions among them are often blurred.

In an effort to improve consistency, many jurisdictions are currently trying to establish standards that are agreed upon and shared by teachers and by the broader public (e.g., OAC-Teacher Inservice Program, Ministry Benchmarks). There is also some evidence that, when teachers are supplied with externally-developed guidelines and experience in implementing instruction, inter-marker reliability among teachers improved (Cousins et al., in press; Ontario Ministry of Education, 1988).

Assessment Methods

Classroom assessment is a frequent and multi-faceted activity. Teachers do not rely on a single source of data for evaluating student achievement but use a variety of methods, including teacher-made paper and pencil tests, structured performance assessments, informal observation and classroom questioning and, text-embedded assessments (Anderson, 1989; Stiggins and Bridgeford, 1985; Wilson, 1989, 1990; Wilson et al., 1989). Teachers also assess their students frequently (Anderson, 1989; Fordham, 1983; Gullickson, 1984;) and students expect that frequent assessment will occur (Gullickson, 1984).

Like most instruction, assessment is done in the classroom and involves no other teachers or colleagues (Wilson et al., 1989). Teachers prefer to use instruments that they develop themselves. Many studies have shown a strong preference for teacher-made objective tests, and the use of projects, experiment writeups, and written work as a basis for evaluation (Anderson, 1989; Bateson, 1990; Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Stiggins, 1988; Wilson, 1990). Preference for student evaluation procedures varies across subject areas and grade levels (Anderson, 1989; Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985; Traub et al., 1988). By the time students reach the intermediate division, marks are determined substantially by teacher-made tests and in secondary schools, tests scores are equated with achievement (McLean, 1988). Teachers, especially in early grades, do engage in performance-based approaches to assessment (Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985), but structured performance assessment methods, which are more appropriate for assessing higher levels of skill, are rarely used in the Transition Years and beyond.

Many authors (both researchers and educators) have recently addressed the issue of `authentic assessment' -- making assessment methods more consistent with models of curriculum content and cognitive processes rather than with abstract models of test scores (McLean, 1990). The term authentic assessment is intended to convey that assessment tasks themselves are real instances of extended performances, rather than proxies or estimators of actual learning goals (Shepard, 1991b). The interest in authentic assessment comes from a growing recognition that some of the existing methods of assessing student achievement do not adequately describe all that we care to communicate about students. This is particularly true in many American jurisdictions where scores on published standardized tests have become synonymous with achievement and their purpose is largely for sorting students into groups not for informing teachers and benefitting students (Perrone, 1991; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981). Communication about students is jeopardized when a small number of formal exams or tests become the sole indicator of student achievement. Particularly in the senior secondary grades, teachers have come to rely heavily on tests or examinations and on communicating student achievement through marks and have recognized that fundamental change in instruction depends quite seriously upon reform in the assessment of student performance (Linn, Baker, & Dunbar, 1991). As Spady (1991) stated "everyone in our society is familiar with the general meaning of these messages (e.g., 80% means "pretty wonderful" and 45% means "bad"), grades represent a shorthand for the larger and more complex array of behaviours and achievements they are intended to portray". Authentic assessment is premised on the assumption that assessment should be central to learning (Wiggins, 1989) and reflect the complexity and the ambiguity of what is being learned. When students learn that there is one right answer that resides in the head of the teacher or test-maker and that their task is to get the answer by guessing, if necessary, they draw faulty inferences about the purposes and strategies for learning (Shepard, 1991b). Authentic assessments require students to think and to be able to arrive at answers and provide explanations (Shepard, 1991b). Making assessment more authentic requires a significant shift in mindset and in assessment practices. If assessments are to be authentic, they must involve varied settings and purposes and must include assessments collected over several months (and perhaps even years). The tasks must be meaningful to students and will be, by definition, complex (McLean, 1990). They should replicate the challenges and standards of performance that typically face writers, business people, scientists,

community leaders, designers, or historians (Wiggins, 1989) and may take the form of writing essays and reports, conducting individual and group research, designing proposals, assembling portfolios or a myriad of other complex activities. Designing an authentic assessment means that we must first decide what are the actual performances that we want students to be good at and necessitates paying more attention to the expectations for successful performance and to what is acceptable evidence that students have met the expectations (Wiggins, 1989).

Reporting and Follow-up

Reporting of assessment and evaluation information is used for many purposes including accountability to parents and community (Yeh, 1980), grading for the purpose of rank ordering students (Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Stiggins et al., 1989) and for planning, student diagnosis, and placement (Dorr- Bremme, 1983; Fetler, 1982; Yeh, 1980). It has been acknowledged that feedback to students is helpful to them (e.g., Crooks, 1988) and that students want it (Gullickson, 1984), but there is some evidence to show that teachers' emphasis on feedback is variable and may not be beneficial to students (Fordham, 1983).

Teachers use a wide variety of methods and procedures to assess student performance; what is not clear is how teachers combine evaluative information when determining student grades. Teachers often combine scores from a number of different sources to arrive at a final grade. Because there has been little research to investigate the methods that teachers use to combine these scores, we do not know how they make sense of the myriad of data available to them for grading purposes. Stiggins et al. (1989) showed that teachers do not use sophisticated weighted averaging schemes, nor do they use the normal distribution in making normative judgments about students. Teachers in secondary school often weight term tests, quizzes, and assignments, but the weighting of content in the tests is rarely explicit. Percentage marks are used with a spurious appearance of accuracy and meaning, but without communicating expectations or importance of material to either students or parents (McLean, 1990). Some studies have found that there are flaws in teachers' grading practices. Grades or marks are generally a conglomerate of academic and non-academic factors; the quality of the data used to form the grades is not clearly articulated and may not even be known; formative and summative data are often mixed together and the process for summarizing scores can include errors of

aggregation (Rogers, 1991; Stiggins, et al, 1989). It is disconcerting that we know so little about a practice that is as widespread among teachers as summarizing across a large number of small assessments to establish a single score. If some grading procedures are flawed and teachers have little time to analyze their assessment and grading procedures, it is likely that some decisions based on classroom assessment may be faulty. To further complicate the problem Wilson (1990) found that teachers tend to predict patterns of results for students from prior knowledge of their students, even though they make the claim that they do not rely on informal methods of assessment. Grading and reporting are critical elements of evaluation and it is of concern that the measurement literature has virtually ignored this important aspect of the evaluation process (Anderson, 1989).

Authentic assessment tasks are likely to complicate the grading and reporting responsibilities for teachers while, at the same time, enhancing communication about student achievement. Although authentic tasks may lend themselves to the traditional marking categories (letter grades or percentage marks), the categories will need to be accompanied by descriptions, written in terms of the performance that was expected. When parents receive report cards with category marks, accompanied by definitions of the categories, the conversation between parents and the teacher can be conducted in terms of the demonstrated performance of the student (McLean, 1990) and the parent can see what was required, what was submitted and what evaluation it received rather than an abstract evaluation interpretable only by the teacher (McLean, 1990).

CONSEQUENCES OF CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT FOR STUDENTS

Evaluation of student performance and achievement is an integral part of good instruction. It is not something that gets tacked on at the end. Instead, it is a constant and interactive process of learning more and more about each individual student, communicating that knowledge, and helping students and parents use it well. Classroom teachers are the only ones who have the sustained opportunity and the intimate knowledge of both the students and the program that is required to paint vivid pictures of each particular student, especially over the course of time. This has always been the case. As Hymes (1991) writes, "In reality, it is through classroom assessment that attitudes, skills, knowledge and thinking are fostered, nurtured and accelerated - or stifled".

Students are very much affected by the results of classroom assessments done by their teachers. Feedback from the teacher about achievement and about strengths and weaknesses form the foundation upon which students define their capabilities and plan their futures. From the primary student for whom retention in grade is a fear only surpassed by going blind or losing a parent (Shepard and Smith, 1990) to the secondary student whose entrance to university depends on a final mark (McLean, 1985), students perception of themselves and their worth is rooted in the classroom assessment practices of their teachers.

The effects of assessment on students are quite varied. Some are positive and some are negative. Several studies found deleterious effects on students including stereotyping (Byrne, 1990) and use for social comparison (Wilson et al., 1989). There is some evidence that teachers use both scholastic and social information to form initial, lasting impressions about their students (Stiggins et al., 1986) and that they shape the marks to match conclusions that they reach in other ways (Wilson, 1992). Because teachers form early impressions of ability based on scant data about students, Peterson and Barger (1985) suggest that teachers may become fixed on initial impressions based on unreliable, inaccurate information and use subsequent data to maintain a consistent picture of the student. These early and sustained judgements about students can lead to differential patterns of interaction between the teacher and the student. Good and Brophy (1978) found that teachers consistently demanded and reinforced higher quality performance from perceived high achievers than perceived low achievers, and that the teachers were totally unaware of their differing levels of interchanges with students whom they judged to have different abilities. Motivational effects are also attributable to assessment practices. In some cases, external tests (e.g., provincial exams) increase student motivation to learn (Wilson et al., 1989). Slavin (1980) also found positive motivational effects attributable to assessment when he considered the effects of "individually-referenced" testing practices (see also MacIver, 1989; Wilburn & Felps, 1983). Crooks (1988) and Paris et al. (1991) on the other hand, have demonstrated negative motivational consequences of assessment. Stiggins (1989) points out that there is not a simple relationship between grades and motivation. The relationship is complex, not clearly understood and unpredictable. Presumably high grades should constitute a reward and low grades a deterrent. The impact, however, depends on the students expectations and academic history. A student who typically

receives an A will be disappointed with a B and students who routinely receive Ds and Fs will no longer regard academic success as attainable and no longer care about their performance in school. Paris et al. (1991) support the position. In their study of high and low achievers' attitudes towards standardized state-wide tests, they conclude that the results were likely invalid for low achievers because they were less persistent, less motivated, and relinquished effort and appropriate strategies in order to decrease personal anxiety and protect their self-esteem. A few studies have considered the impact of assessment on students in particular learning and evaluation environments. Slavin (1990) emphasizes the point that interdependency among group members is an important distinction between cooperative group learning and small group instructional activities. In his cooperative learning studies, he found that assessment methods that incorporated both group assessment and individual accountability enhanced student learning more than other methods.

It's not surprising to educators that assessment practices have a strong influence on students. It is becoming increasingly evident to measurement specialists that the power of assessments in the lives of students may affect the measurement itself. In a recent article Moss (1992) drew attention to the social consequences of assessment use. She brought into question the adequacy of the traditional measurement concept of validity without explicitly considering the consequences that accompany the use of any assessment.

At this juncture, there has not been sufficient research about the impact of classroom assessment practices to give a comprehensive picture. It is clear, however, that classroom assessment is a significant part of the school experience that we need to understand better.

TEACHER AS ASSESSOR

As was mentioned earlier, teachers are best placed to assess their students and to utilize the information gleaned from those assessments to make continuous program changes and adaptations for their students. Dozens of times a day a teacher asks questions, listens to answers, observes behaviour, corrects worksheets, reads answers, scores test items, and adapts instruction to best teach each student. Unfortunately, teachers and administrators are not always able to explain their own

assessment practices or to defend them against critics. This inability to describe assessment practices has contributed to a belief on the part of lay persons and policymakers that the best and only fair way to measure schooling outcomes is by using standardized paper and pencil tests. There are a number of researchers currently engaged in work to increase our understanding of classroom assessment who have offered explanations for the ways in which teachers make decisions and have proposed directions for improving classroom assessment practices. Stiggins et al. (1986) reported that classroom assessment is carried out by teachers whose formal training in assessment is often minimal and narrow in focus. In a recent Kappan article Stiggins (1991) describes a disturbing paradox:

> We are a society that has come to care very much about high standards of achievement, but we are a society that is incapable of understanding whether those standards are being met ...We are a nation of assessment illiterates ...educators and non-educators alike are not sufficiently literate in the basics of assessment to know whether or not their achievement data are sound or unsound ...or to be critical consumers of assessment data (p.535).

Other researchers have examined teachers' current knowledge and skill level in assessment methods. Virtually all have concluded the same thing - fundamental measurement theory is missing in the classroom (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985; Schafer & Lissitz, 1987; Wilson, 1989; 1990). Oddly enough some teachers feel quite comfortable with their level of expertise in assessment practice and have no desire for further training (Gullickson, 1984; Schafer & Lissitz, 1987; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1988). Stiggins (1991) attributes this comfort to a lack of understanding about what it takes to produce high-quality achievement data. Teachers who are assessment illiterate are willing to accept achievement data at face value and lack the tools to be critical consumers of assessment information. Many teachers, however, indicate concern about and interest in improving the quality of their classroom assessments (Stiggins et al., 1986) but inservice opportunities are rare (Stiggins, 1988) and the "elemental stuff" of most measurement course and textbooks is irrelevant to classroom teachers (McLean, 1985).

Wilson (personal communication, Dec. 4, 1992) offers a somewhat different viewpoint. He proposes that teachers use their tacit knowledge about their students and about the areas of expertise. His observations of teachers suggest that they

operate as experts or connoisseurs in their fields and that they deal with the complexity of the evaluation process by making "best-judgement" decisions about how to gather, use and report assessment information and, although they often cannot explain what they did, the outcome may be closer to an accurate (or valid) description of student achievement than would have accrued from following a set of measurement rules.

A number of researchers have been critical of teacher-training institutions for failing to equip teachers with the skills that they need to assess student learning. Stiggins (quoted in Hymes, 1991) says "we spend all available resources training teachers and administrators to produce learning, put that training to work in schools and then allocate virtually no resources to train practitioners in sound methods of assessing the outcomes of our efforts". It is quite possible that the failure of teacher pre-service and inservice training programs to provide teachers with measurement skills is contributing to the use of unsound measurement procedures in our schools that could result in poor decision-making about instruction and about individual students (Gullickson, 1984; Schafer & Lissitz, 1987; Stiggins et al., 1986). Unless there is a concerted effort to change, this condition is likely to continue because most teacher training (and administrator training) programs do not require courses in assessment and evaluation (Schafer and Lissitz, 1987).

CULTURE, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Classroom assessment may occur behind the closed doors of the classroom, but it is heavily influenced by the world that teachers and students inhabit most directly -- their school. The school or school board policies and procedures are the ultimate arbiter of classroom assessment practices. Wilson (1992) carried out an in-depth investigation of classroom assessment practices in selected schools in British Columbia and Ontario. His study found that evaluation for reporting, control, and prediction were more highly rated by teachers than those related to improving the teaching-learning process. This was especially the case at the secondary level where these different purposes actually resulted in competing expectations. So, while teachers are encouraged to construct differentiated programs for different students, at the same time they are required to provide relative judgements about performance; while they are exhorted to use broad-based assessments and consider all facets of student learning, the rounded assessments of students' work, diligence,

behaviour and attitude that characterize teachers' anecdotal and verbal accounts are replaced, in most reporting, with numeric or letter summaries. In these numeric or letter summaries students are explicitly or implicitly compared to their cohorts. While there is increasing attention to making connections for students among disciplines and integrating ideas, a policy that provides for the final grade to be the average of the various terms implies that learning is segmented and compartmentalized. Wilson observed that "many teachers in our studies react to this environment by becoming routinized data gatherers for administrative purposes". Consequently, teachers beyond the primary grades learn that student assessment is fundamentally a grading and reporting game, and so do their students (Wilson, 1992). While achieving good marks remains a priority of students, learning may become secondary.

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

Our search for empirical research that investigates effective student evaluation practices proved to be somewhat futile. Although there are many descriptions and suggestions about how teachers might change their assessment practices to make them more effective, we found almost no studies that evaluated the impact of using these practices. It also seems clear that the definition of a high-quality assessment varies as the assessment context changes and it is not possible to give teachers a "cookbook" or formula for quality to apply in the classroom. Designing or choosing the best assessment method and using the information well will continue to be a major part of the learning/teaching process for both the student and the teacher (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1989). Classroom assessments need not be formal. Their strength lies in the fact that they are designed to support instruction, tied to curriculum, meaningful to students, provide quick, detailed and complex feedback, are conducted in a climate of trust and can reach for the conceptually important questions. The teacher, often with the students, can create assessments to serve the immediate purposes in the classroom. Because classroom assessments are ongoing and varied, they do not have to meet the stringent standards of accuracy that have been defined for standardized tests. Errors made in judging individual students are less serious and more easily redressed in classrooms as teachers gather more evidence (Shepard, 1989). Because teachers have the luxury of considering student questions and responses during assessments, they are able to restructure the problem and accept more than one answer as correct. Good classroom assessment is

adaptable and responsive not rigid or secretive. Even though there is considerable debate about why, what and how classroom assessment should occur, there are some fundamental measurement principles and quality-control guidelines that should apply to any kind of assessment of students and should be evident in teachers' classroom assessment practices, whether they are using traditional methods or authentic tasks:

- One of the basic tenets of sound assessment in any context is that the assessor should have a clear understanding of the achievement targets to be attained by the students so that these targets can be translated into proper assessments (Stiggins, in press, a). These targets may be enhanced or extended as a result of the assessment process but both teacher and students should know what is being assessed.

- It is important that teachers are able to use the full range of assessment methods (i.e., paper-and-pencil tests, performance assessments with teacher judgment and direct personal communication with the student) to choose the appropriate methods for their purposes and to provide more authentic assessments of students' achievement (Wiggins, 1989; Stiggins, 1991).

- Unless an assessment approach is reliable (i.e., dependable) it will not provide meaningful information about student achievement. Although single assessment procedures may not be highly reliable, the accumulation of data gathered about individual students over the course or a school year has much more accuracy (Shepard, 1989). One important kind of reliability in classroom assessment is inter-rater reliability. This kind of reliability refers to the amount of agreement that exists among teachers in how they evaluate student work. It includes having a shared understanding about the criteria for assessment and about the standards that should be applied. Classroom assessments should be as systematic and objective as possible and should not reflect the idiosyncratic perceptions and biases of the person performing the evaluation (Stiggins, 1987).

- Assessment procedures are not ends in themselves. They are designed to show the underlying knowledge or attitude or skill of the student. If assessment procedure is valid, it accurately portrays what it purports to

measure and the results are a good reflection of the student's knowledge, attitude or skill development. To do this teachers must ensure a good match between the intended outcomes and the assessment strategy, be clear about what is acceptable as evidence of success and be conscious of the social consequences of the assessment that might influence the assessment. They also need to control for various sources of extraneous interference that can cause them to mismeasure or misinterpret achievement.

- Teachers and administrators must understand the rules of evidence that govern the use of the different assessment methods so that they can distinguish sound from unsound uses of assessment data and identify factors that may bias the results and mislead decision-makers (Stiggins, 1991).

- Teachers and administrators must have a coherent orientation toward evaluation by recognizing and formally instituting a system of evaluation that accommodates formative evaluation for teaching/learning purposes and program adaptation and the summative evaluation for reporting purposes.

Students count on their teachers to offer good instruction and good assessments so that they can make sound decisions. Making sound decisions requires adequate data. When teachers and administrators understand the differences between sound and unsound data, they can provide the effective and efficient instruction that students count on (Stiggins, 1991). There are many things that teachers and administrators can do to ensure that they are good critical producers and consumers of assessment data. They can begin by reflecting on their own classroom assessment and school policies and asking questions about existing practices. They can also seek training to become better assessors and evaluators, using and refining the many different and varied methods that they already employ (i.e., measuring higher order thinking, creating quality paper-and-pencil tests, integrating assessment and instruction through oral questioning techniques, designing quality performance assessments based on observation and professional judgement) (Stiggins et al., 1986). Many researchers support strongly the need for institutionalized training both at pre-service and inservice levels (Crooks, 1988; Gullickson, 1984; Schafer & Lissitz, 1987; Stiggins, 1988; Yeh, 1980). The route for teachers to become good classroom assessors is best characterized by Fullan (1991) in his description of how to cope with increasing educational change:

> the only way out of the dilemma is for individuals to take responsibility for empowering themselves and others through becoming experts. (p.353)

IMPLICATIONS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Assessment has not been part of most teachers' training and those who have taken measurement courses have found them to be irrelevant to classroom practice. It is interesting to note that the group who have become most vocal about the need for paying more attention to classroom assessment are measurement experts who have had a stranglehold on the field of assessment and evaluation for many decades. In recent years, they have become very aware that the bulk of their work related to measurement theory, specifically theory and procedures to improve standardized, norm-referenced tests, was virtually useless to teachers in classrooms and has widened the gap between measurement and classroom instruction (Rogers, 1991).

As there is more interest in testing for accountability and educational reform, testing and assessment practices of all kinds become more important for teachers and students. Given the potential role of standardized tests in educational policy, it is essential that teachers have a better understanding of testing technology and its uses and abuses. However, the vision of measurement and evaluation is not limited to standardized tests. In fact, in Ontario such tests play a very small role indeed. Assessment of student learning is a central part of teaching. Measurement courses need to reflect the reality of schools and classrooms and operate from a very broad conception of assessment so that teachers become skilled and competent in making principled judgments and decisions on their students behalf (Linn, 1990). Although these are not exhaustive and will undoubtedly change with our growing understanding of classroom assessment, Linn (1990) reviewed the literature related to *teachers' training needs* in assessment and evaluation and identified 7 general topics that deserve emphasis for teachers:

- Planning and Constructing Classroom Tests: Since teacher-made tests tend to give inordinate attention to lower cognitive levels than teachers stated

objectives would justify, there is a need to help teachers to prepare classroom tests and other evaluation activities that put greater emphasis on deep understanding. Assessments need to be designed that probe the higher order thinking regardless of the content or the level of instruction. A useful aid in constructing tests that better assess all levels of thinking is a table of specifications that places the three kinds of assessment (oral, paper-and-pencil and performance) in the rows and five levels of thinking skills (recall, analysis, comparison, inference and evaluation) in the columns. Filling in the cells of this matrix encourages the planning of assessments that do more than cover the recall row.

- Use of Non-Test Evaluation Procedures: Teachers recognize the need for better preparation in the use of a wide range of evaluation procedures other than traditional tests; techniques like oral questioning and performance assessment through classroom observation and professional judgement. Broadening the evaluation repertoire of teachers can lead to more authentic assessments that are contextualized, complex intellectual challenges, not fragmented and static bits or tasks (Wiggins,1989).

- Use of Assessment Results for Instructional Planning and Formative Evaluation: All kinds of assessment information can be useful for program planning. However, effective use of assessment information in planning instruction requires a thorough understanding of testing and non-testing evaluation procedures and the integration of assessment with instruction in the subject matter.

- Use of Assessment Results for Summative Evaluation: Teachers are expected to make summative evaluation and to grade their students' achievements. Because grading is inevitable and can have important implications for judgements concerning students, for what students perceive as important and for students feelings about themselves, it is essential that teachers understand the potential positive and negative influences of their summative evaluations. They also need to understand the implications of different approaches to marking and combining grades so that the resulting summative evaluation accurately and fairly reflects student accomplishments

that are consistent with the teacher's instructional priorities and stated expectations.

- Administration and Scoring of Evaluation Procedures: This task appears to be straightforward but administration and scoring of non-test assessment procedures is sometimes complicated because the teacher has to create conditions that elicit the desired performances and establish scoring procedures that relate to their criteria and standards.

- Selection and Use of Published Tests: As cries for accountability become louder, teachers need to be informed about the types of tests that may be used and their strengths and limitations for particular applications. They need to understand the various contexts in which standardized tests are used and the appropriate interpretation of results. Not only do teachers need to be informed about the technical aspects of standardized testing, they need to be knowledgable about the ethical issues that emerge when assessment serves external accountability functions.

- Principles of Measurement: Finally, there are some general principles of measurement that teachers should be familiar with. Concepts of reliability and validity are essential to the evaluation of any assessment procedure and are guiding principles that can provide a perspective for evaluation assessments, based on qualitative information obtained from informal classroom observations as well as the scores that are computed on tests and examinations.

Curriculum and instruction are likely to change substantially in the Transition Years. Teachers will be experimenting with a wide variety of different approaches (e.g., cooperative learning, integrated curriculum, team teaching). As this happens, it is critical that assessment practices keep pace with other program changes. There is too much at stake for assessment practices to lag behind. Because teacher training programs often do not include assessment courses, many teachers and administrators lack sufficient knowledge about sound assessment practices to make the necessary changes. In light of this knowledge gap, classroom assessment should be a high priority on the staff development agenda.

References

Airasian, P. (1984). *Classroom assessment and educational improvement.* Unpublished manuscript, cited in Stiggins et al. (1986).

Anderson, J. O. (1989). Evaluation of student achievement: Teacher practices and educational measurement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35* (2), 123-133.

Bateson, D. J. (1990). Measurement and evaluation practices of British Columbia science teachers. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 36* (1), 45-51.

Bloom, B. S., (ed.) (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives,* New York: David McKay Co., Inc.

Bloom, B. S. (1984). The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. *Educational Leadership, 41* (May): 4-17.

Brophy, J. and Good, T. (1974). *Teacher-student relationships.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Byrne, B. M. (1990). Self concept and academic achievement: Investigating their importance as discriminators of academic track membership in high school. *Canadian Journal of Education, 15* (2), 173-182.

Cousins, J. B., Ross, J. A., & Prentice, M. (in press). Effects of training on teachers' ability to assess student performance on higher order thinking skills. *The Alberta Journal of Education.*

Costa, A. (1989) Re-assessing assessment. *Educational Leadership,* (April), 3.

Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research, 58* (4), 438-481.

Dassa, C. (1990). From a horizontal to a vertical method of integrating educational diagnosis with classroom assessment. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 36* (1), 35-44.

Dorr-Bremme, D. W. (1983). Assessing students: Teachers' routine practices and reasoning. *Evaluation Comment, 6* (4), 1-11.

Egan, O., & Archer, P. (1985). The accuracy of teachers' ratings of ability: A regression model. *American Educational Research Journal, 22* (1), 25-34.

Fetler, M. (1982). *Use of evaluation data and school achievement.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April. (ERIC No.ED218343).

Fleming, M. & Chambers, B. (1983). Teacher-made tests: Windows on the classroom. In Hathaway, W.(ed.) *Testing in the schools: New directions for testing and measurement.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Fordham, A. M. (1983). *The context of teaching and learning: Report on the First Phase of the IEA Classroom Environment Study.* Australian Council for Educational Research.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The New Meaning of Education Change.* Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1978). *Looking in classrooms.* New York: Harper and Row.

Gullickson, A. R. (1984). Teacher perspectives of their instructional use of tests. *Journal of Educational Research, 77* (4), 244-248.

Haney, W. (1991). We must take care: fitting assessments to function. In Perrone, V. (ed.) *Expanding Student Assessment.* ASCD, 142-166.

Hargreaves, A. & Earl, L. (1990). *The Rights of Passage.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Hoge, R. D. & Coladaci, T. (1989). Teacher-based judgments of academic achievement: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 59* (3), 297-313.

Hymes, D. (1991). *The Changing Face of Testing and Assessment.* American Association of School Administrators.

Linn, R. L. (1990). Essentials of student assessment: from accountability to instructional aid. *Teachers College Record, 91* (3) 422-436

Linn, R. L., Baker, E. L. & Dunbar, S. B. (1991). Complex, performance-based assessment: Expectations and validation criteria. *Educational Researcher, 20* (8), 15-21.

MacIver, D. (1989). *Effective practices and structures for middle grades education.* Charleston, WV: Policy & Planning Centre, Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 306 668)

McLean, L. D. (1988). Achievement measures made relevant to pedagogy. *McGill Journal of Education* 23 (3), 243-252.

McLean, L. D. (1985). *The craft of student evaluation Canada.* Toronto: Canadian Education Association.

McLean, L. D. (1990). Time to replace the classroom test with authentic measurement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 36* (1), 78-84.

Moss, P. A. (1992). Shifting conceptions of validity in educational measurement: Implications for performance assessment. *Review of Educational Research, 62* (3), 229-258.

Natriello, G. (1987). The impact of evaluation processes in students. *Educational Psychologist,* 22 155-175.

Ontario Ministry of Education (1988). *Provincial report: Examination review OAC 1 English.* Ontario: Ministry of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education (1989). *Ontario Schools: Intermediate and Senior.* Ontario: Ministry of Education.

Oregon Department of Education. (1989). Results and analysis of the 1989 Oregon statewide writing assessment. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 315 795)

Paris, S. G., Lawton, T. A., Turner, J. C., and Roth, J. L. (1991). A development perspective on standardized achievement testing. *Educational Researcher, 20* (5), 12-20.

Perrone, V. (ed.) (1991). *Expanding Student Assessment.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Peterson, P. and Barger, S. (1985). Attribution Theory and teacher expectancy. In J. Dasek, V. Hall and W. Meyer (ed.) *Teacher expectancies.* Hillsdale, NJ. Lawrence Earlbaum.

Pratt, D. (forthcoming). *Curriculum Planning: A Handbook of Materials for Professional Educators.*

Robinson, F. J., Ross, J. A., & White, F. (1985). *Curriculum development for effective instruction.* Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Rogers, W.T. (1991). Educational assessment in Canada. The Alberta Journal of *Educational Research, 36* (2), 179-192.

Salmon-Cox, L. (1981), Teachers and Standardized achievement tests: What's really happening? *Phi Delta Kappan, 62,* 631-634.

Schafer, W. D., & Lissitz, R. W. (1987). Measurement training for school personnel: Recommendations and reality. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38* (3), 57-63.

Shepard, L. (1989). Why we need better assessments. *Educational Leadership, April,* 4-9.

Shepard, L. A. (1991a). Psychometricians' beliefs about learning. *Educational Researcher, 20,* (7), 2-10.

Shepard, L. A. (1991b). Interview of assessment issues with Lorie Shepard. *Educational Researcher, March,* 21-27.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1989). *Flunking Grades: research and policies on retention.* The Falmer Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1980). Effects of individual learning expectations on student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72* (4), 520-524.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Practice and Research.* Prentice-Hall.

Smith, M. L. (1991). Put to the test: The effects of external testing on teachers. *Educational Researcher, 20* (5), 8-11.

Spady, W. (1991). Shifting the grading paradigm that pervades education, *Outcomes.*

Sprafkin, R. P. (1980). The assessment of social skills: An overview. *School Psychology Review, 9* (1), 14-20.

Sproull, L. & Zubrow, D. (1981). Standardized testing from the administrative perspective. *Phi Delta Kappan, 62* (9), 628-631.

Stiggins, R. J. (1987). Design and development of performance assessment. *Educational: Measurement: Issues and Practices, Fall,* 33-42.

Stiggins, R. J. (1988). Revitalizing classroom assessment: The highest instructional priority. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69* (5), 363-368.

Stiggins, R. J. (1989). *A practical guide for developing sound grading practices,* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Stiggins, R. J. (1990). *Understanding the meaning and importance of quality classroom assessment.* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Stiggins, R. J. (1991). Assessment literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan, March,* 534-539.

Stiggins, R. J. (in press a). Teacher training in assessment: Overcoming the neglect. In Wise, S. *Teacher Training in Assessment.*

Stiggins, R. J. (in press b). Facing the challenges of an assessment era. *Applied Educational Measurement.*

Stiggins, R. J., & Bridgeford, N. J. (1985). The ecology of classroom assessment. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 22* (4), 271-286.

Stiggins, R. J., Conklin, N. & Bridgeford (1986). Classroom assessment: A key to effective education. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, Vol 5,* #2.

Stiggins, R. J., Frisbie, D. A., & Griswold, P. A. (1989). Inside high school grading practices: Building a research agenda. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, Summer,* 5-14.

Stiggins, R. J., Conklin N, & Associates (in press). *In Teacher's Hands: Investigating the Practices of Classroom Assessment.* Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Traub, R., Nagy, P., MacRury, K., & Klaiman, R. (1988). *Teacher assessment practices in a senior high school math course.* Final Report of OISE Transfer Grant Project # 52-1028. Toronto, ON: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Wiggins, G. (1989). A true test: toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70* (9) 703-13.

Wilburn, K. T., & Felps, B. C. (1983). *Do pupil grading methods effect middle school students' achievement: A comparison of criterion-referenced vs norm-referenced evaluation*. Technical Research Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 229 451)

Wilson, R. J. (1989). Evaluating student achievement in an Ontario high school. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35* (2), 134-144.

Wilson, R. J. (1990). Classroom processes in evaluating student achievement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 36* (1), 4-17.

Wilson, R. J. (1992). *Roles and Goals: Evaluation of Student Achievement in Schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Educational Research Officers of Ontario.

Wilson, R., Rees, R., & Connock, M. (1989). Classroom practices in evaluation: A progress report from the Ecology of Evaluation Project. *Research Forum, Winter*, 4-7.

Wilson, R. and Rees, R. (1990). The ecology of assessment: evaluation in educational settings. *Canadian Journal of Education, 15*(3) 215-228.

Wolf, D., LeMahieu, P. & Eresh, J. (1992). Good measure: assessment as a tool for educational reform. *Educational Leadership, 49* (8) 8-13.

Yeh, J. (1980). *A Reanalysis of Test Use Data (CSE Report No. 143)*. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

2.
Inservice Education of Teachers (INSET): An Interpretive Review

Ardra Cole and Dennis Thiessen

The inservice education of teachers (INSET) was one of the primary aspects of Transition Years pilot site initiatives to be examined in the larger study of which this volume of literature reviews is a part. Objectives for research on teacher inservice in the pilot sites were:

- to identify and describe the range of INSET policies and practices;
- to determine how INSET is integrated with the other components of the pilot site projects;
- to determine how INSET initiatives are translated into classroom practices;
- to identify factors and conditions influencing teacher development in general and with respect to the projects in particular;
- to gain insight into the culture of the workplace and determine how teachers are involved in the various restructuring initiatives;
- to determine the nature, extent, and influence of interactions between and among teachers and between teachers and others in the school (e.g., administrators, parents, and students).

These objectives acknowledge what the initial descriptions and progress reports of the pilot site projects indicated: namely, an emphasis on school-based and teacher-centred inservice practices. After a brief comment on more structured and enduring forms of INSET, our review concentrates on that part of the literature which portrays teachers actively constructing professional learning experiences to facilitate their ongoing development in the school workplace.

INSET can vary significantly in the scope of teacher participation, the form of professional learning, and the preferred image of the teacher which is assumed or explicitly adopted.

Seemingly similar experiences often have quite distinct enactments and justifications; therefore, in an effort to make sense of the wide spectrum of INSET approaches, we also consider the perspectives underlying these practices. The inclusion of perspective enables us to address what works within a broader framework of what is assumed and valued in differing contexts.

In terms of quantity, the INSET literature is staggering; however, descriptive accounts of INSET programs and position papers on recommended practices far exceed research reports (though the latter documents are numerous). Our searches generated numerous references; but the quantity far exceeded the quality of the reported work. The conceptual base, though promising in many recent publications (e.g. Houston, Sikula, and Haberman, 1990), is generally under-developed. Empirical or philosophical support for the numerous positions and exhortations about preferred INSET practices is relatively thin. Innovations are not always embedded in a wider framework or elaborated in a research context. Consequently, we rely on available syntheses of INSET studies, selected inquiries, and rigorous analyses or commentaries which are relevant to our emphases on school-based and teacher-centred ideas.

In the following sections, we provide: an overview of INSET practices; a summary of guidelines for effective INSET; a review of emerging INSET perspectives; and a statement on the relationship of this review to the Transition Years Project. In an interpretive review, we hope to raise a consciousness about themes, dilemmas, or questions pertinent to the INSET experiences we anticipate in use in the project schools. In our list of references, we include those cited in the text as well as those reviewed for our analysis.

INSET Practices[1]

For years, many teachers equated INSET with either professional development days organized by school boards and teachers' federations or additional qualifications courses offered by faculties of education and endorsed by the Ministry of Education. Relatively short sessions, often in the form of workshops delivered by outside experts, were the dominant mode. Teachers were expected to attend, receive the information, return to their classrooms, and implement their newly-acquired knowledge.

These traditional approaches efficiently can convey messages about new policies to large numbers of teachers: they can create opportunities to meet colleagues outside their own schools, and, if done effectively, motivate the audience to further action as well. However, they have not consistently lead to substantial changes. The reasons for failure offered by Fullan (1979, p.3) in an earlier critique still hold today:

- Topics are frequently selected by people other than those for whom the inservice is intended;
- Follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in inservice programs occurs in only a very small minority of cases;
- Follow-up evaluation occurs infrequently;
- Inservice programs rarely address the needs and concerns of individual teachers;
- The majority of programs involve teachers from many different schools and/or school districts, but there is no recognition of the differential impact of positive and negative factors within the systems to which they must return; and
- There is a profound lack of any conceptual basis in the planning and implementing of inservice programs that would ensure their effectiveness.

Typical INSET practices and their associated problems persist though increasingly as a historical backdrop to more intensive, job-embedded, and varied approaches. More recently, diversification has become the norm. In a review of the inservice education of teachers, Eraut (1987, p. 731) describes the range of activities currently in use:

> The course mode tends to dominate INSET provision. Other modes include groupwork such as discussion groups, study groups, reading groups, conferences, and staff meetings; and participation in development activities such as materials production, curriculum design, or school-based evaluation. A fourth type of mode is an advisory service, in which advice or assistance is provided to an individual or group of teachers by a fellow-teacher, supervisor, district advisor, or external consultant. A fifth mode, personal INSET, includes private study, various forms of self-evaluation, and reflection on one's teaching. Then finally there are various experiential modes,

ranging from minimal involvement by attending a demonstration or making a brief visit, through short periods of participant observation in other schools or work experience outside the education sector, to long secondments of a year or more to curriculum projects, research projects, or advisory or "master teacher" roles. Participation in team teaching and acting as a tutor to trainee teachers can also be considered as a form of job-embedded experiential INSET.

Today, experienced teachers often have more to choose from. In the following subsections, three aspects of current INSET practices are examined:

(i) A framework for understanding recent INSET practices: this framework emphasizes location (in schools or through organizational units) and ownership (degree to which teachers determine the reasons, content, and method of INSET).
(ii) The organization of INSET according to staff development models: particular emphasis is given to ways in which teachers can pursue their own development;
(iii) Themes emphasizing essential directions and characteristics of INSET practices.

Framework for Understanding Recent INSET Practices

The school is becoming the preferred INSET site and teachers are assuming more of the INSET leadership. In a recent review of innovations, Thiessen and Kilcher (1993) developed a framework which differentiated INSET practices as either *by teachers and in schools* or *for teachers and within/across organizations*. Table 3.1 lists two categories of INSET practices. In many cases, the two categories intersect with strategies *by teachers and in schools* as the life force in the enabling structures created as part of strategies for *teachers and within/across schools*. With our focus on school-based and teacher-centred INSET experiences, we elaborate on the *strategies by teachers and in schools*.

INSET practices *by teachers and in schools* involve teachers acting as the primary sources and agents of their own learning. The school and the interactions within the school act as the base of and medium for development. Approaches in this category, then, are in the hands and minds of teachers as part of their daily work in classrooms and schools. Teacher development is coupled with school development; individual development is embedded in organizational development.

When teachers are organizing for their own professional develop-ment they work alone, with one other person, or in groups. We see two levels of groups working together for teacher development. In some cases, small groups of teachers work on a project while, in other cases, entire staffs are involved in problem solving and decision-making activities addressing changes to workplace conditions in schools and learning conditions in classrooms.

A repertoire of strategies is available for teachers who prefer to learn on their own. Thinking about and inquiring into their daily classroom and school experiences makes explicit the knowledge and skills teachers bring to their work. Individual approaches value the personal practical dimensions of teachers' knowledge and the self-reliant capacity of teachers to direct their own learning. Classrooms become laboratories for the development of both students and teachers.

In recognition of the complexity of teaching, many strategies bring colleagues together to share expertise, to exchange materials and ideas, and to support one another in problem solving and experimentation. Teacher colleague roles differ in responsibilities, compensation, and amount of release time. Teachers offer assistance and support as enrichment coordinators, instructional teacher leaders, peer observer/evaluators, project coordinators, grade level chairs, lead teachers, coaches, and mentors. While they can provide leadership for individuals, groups, or projects, many of their interactions in these new roles are one-on-one encounters with a fellow teacher. Regardless of the approach, the assumption remains the same: mutual development best evolves from the extended and reciprocal work of peers in pairs.

A number of writers (e.g. Fullan, 1991; Hargreaves, 1989; Little, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989) have linked the impact of workplace conditions to the degree and extent to which innovations take hold or not. These writers suggest that until we address the norms and expectations that guide behaviour (e.g., patterns of interaction among teachers) and define the way schools are organized, many other types of reforms will be less successful.

Table 3.1

Spectrum of INSET Practices

Strategies By Teachers and In Schools	
Individual	•writing •self-evaluation •teacher as researcher •individually guided professional development
Pairs	•teachers as colleagues •coaching •mentoring
Groups	•support groups •action research •school improvement
Strategies For Teachers and Within/Across Organizations	
Support Systems	•institutes, short courses •teacher leadership positions •instructional supervision
Centres	•teacher centres •research and professional development centres •professional development schools
Partnerships	•school-university •networks •organizational cooperation

Group strategies for teacher development and school improvement are important for several reasons. Such strategies facilitate program coordination and serve to reduce fragmentation; this helps to keep development "in sync." These strategies are particularly important when addressing problems that go beyond one or two classrooms. Finally, group strategies serve to promote collegiality and teamwork among staff members and are essential for building collaborative cultures and restructured schools.

Staff Development Models

The second lens for viewing staff development organizes structures and procedures into discrete models.

Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990) discuss the supporting arguments and evidence of five models for staff development. The models offer alternate conceptual and operational paths toward staff development but are linked by their belief in teachers as the primary actors in their own learning. Teachers, consequently, figure prominently in the implementation of each model but in strategically different ways:

- *Individually guided staff development* : teachers plan for and pursue activities to promote their own learning;
- *Observation/assessment* : teachers are provided objective data and feedback on their classroom practice;
- *Development/improvement process* : teachers are involved in developing curriculum, designing programs, and engaging in a school improvement process;
- *Training* : teachers are focused on the acquisition of knowledge or skills through individual or group instruction;
- *Inquiry*: teachers are engaged in problem posing, data collecting, and innovative practices based on interpreting the results of their studies.

These models provide a scaffold for planning and benchmarks for monitoring the implementation and evaluation of INSET practices.

Themes

The third lens through which to see INSET approaches involves the themes represented by particular strategies. As INSET moves into the school and within the jurisdiction of teachers, we detect five interrelated themes: collaboration, integration, reflection, experience, and inquiry.

Collaboration

Collaboration in INSET activities depends on the capacity of teachers and organizations to engage in a process of mutual development. Participants strive to share their expertise (provide assistance, exchange resources, swap stories), their understanding (negotiate meaning, cooperatively plan, deliberate alternatives), and their control (joint decision making, mutual influence and constraint). Professional education is a social project.

Many of the teacher leadership initiatives - mentoring, coaching, lead teachers - are examples of collaborative innovations. Organizational partnerships - teacher centres, school-university consortia, professional development schools - are structural versions of collaborative endeavours.

Integration

Integration in INSET activities is about connections, in ideas, experiences, courses or programs, individuals or groups, and procedures or structures. Participants seek linkages (sort out roles, define relationships), determine common elements (discover themes, create bonds), or become a unit (synthesize interests, build from within the interaction). Development comes from the combination of previously discrete phenomena.

Integration is common to many INSET approaches. Teachers use videotapes of classroom events to reconstruct, reconsider, and make sense of their experiences. Additional qualifications' programs interrelate clinical and course work. In action research projects, teachers conduct personal inquiries as a basis of dialogue, critique, and eventually school improvement.

Reflection

Reflection in INSET activities involves both the intuitive and deliberate consideration of practice. Participants review what works in the circumstances of the moment (adapt spontaneously, assess technical merits), explore the assumptions embedded in their actions (make the implicit, explicit; define images), and critique the choices represented by their decisions (evaluate reasons and implications). The source of learning is in the construing and reconstruing of what is done and why it is done in particular ways.

Individuals who write journals can alter the scope of their reflections and consider classroom, school, or societal consequences of their behaviours. Institutes sometime assign biographical and autobiographical projects as tools for reflection.

Experience

The theme of experience acknowledges the importance of context and the personal and practical significance of the situation in which individuals work. Participants carry back validated practices to their workplace (try out ideas, test applications), adapt particular approaches to their own settings (change routines, elicit alternatives), or generate novel solutions (solve problems, create a new strategy). Doing one's job is simultaneously learning to do one's job.

A number of such school-based initiatives as mentor teachers, self-evaluation and school improvement ground their endeavours in the practical experience of participants. Training modules use such experience for rehearsal and feedback.

Inquiry

Inquiry-oriented INSET transforms interactions and observations into spirals of sense-making (Thiessen & Kilcher, 1993). Participants orient their inclinations to know toward a search for understanding (ask questions, record happenings), an improvement of current practices (compare perspectives, plan-act-observe-reflect), or a questioning of what is or should be (review possibilities, analyze options). Exploring the puzzles and perplexities of daily occurrences is an educational endeavour.

An informal record of particular students, an interview with a colleague, or an observation of another classroom offers a reflexive source for mutual understanding.

Action research is a process in which teachers critically examine and improve their situations and practices. Engaging in inquiry *for* and *as* development is available.

The descriptive INSET literature reveals the range and complexity of current practices. Across strategies, models, and themes INSET has shifted the focus of control to teachers and the sphere of action to the school. Research and evaluation have followed the shift at first documenting the changes and later searching for principles to guide subsequent applications. We now turn to the sometimes elusive search for "best practices."

Guidelines for Effective INSET

When INSET has an impact, what makes it work? Over the last two decades, researchers have returned to this question updating the knowledge base, sifting through and synthesizing the most promising studies, and setting up programs to incorporate, test, and refine the results of this search. In an earlier analysis, Thiessen (1984) identified five guidelines for effective professional development. His "review of reviews"[2] determined that effective professional development is facilitated by conditions which:

- require ongoing interaction between those educators who experience and those educators who are responsible for professional development;
- focus on classroom and school practices which are personally and professionally significant to teachers;
- provide resources, personnel, and administrative support;
- include follow-up, collegial assistance, and time to experiment with new practices; and
- interrelates planning, implementation, and evaluation of professional development activities.

For the most part, then, these earlier guidelines centred on program organization, resources and improvement.

Recent analyses and recommendations echo past suggestions but in more complex and varied combinations. For example, Loucks-Horsley et al. (1987:8) highlight 10 programatic dimensions in their list of characteristics of successful staff development:

1. collegiality and collaboration;
2. experimentation and risk taking;
3. incorporation of available knowledge bases;
4. participant involvement in all phases of the strategy or program;
5. time to work on and assimilate new learnings;
6. leadership and sustained administrative support;
7. appropriate incentives and rewards;
8. designs built on principles of adult learning and the change process;
9. integration of individual goals with school and system goals;
10. formal placement of the program within the philosophy and organizational structure of the school and system.

Viewing the problem from a broader perspective, Fullan (1991:341-343) offers three guidelines for effective professional development:

1. Faculties and schools should use three interrelated strategies - faculty renewal, program innovation, and knowledge production - to establish their new niche as respected and effective professional schools.

2. Learning - in this case of adults - must permeate everything the district and school do; it must be held as equally important for all staff regardless of position; districts and schools must strive to coordinate and integrate staff development.

3. All promoters of professional development should pay attention to and worry about two fundamental requirements: (1) incorporating the attributes of successful professional development in as many activities as possible, (such as those listed by Loucks-Horsley et al., 1987) and (2) ensuring that the ultimate purpose of professional development is less to implement a specific innovation or policy and more to create individual and organizational habits and structures that make continuous learning a valued and endemic part of the culture of schools and teaching.

In these *macro* recommendations, Fullan begins with teacher education as a continuum (career-long process incorporating preservice, induction, and inservice

experiences), situates teacher learning within a constellation of organizational partnerships, and interrelates individual and institutional development.

From yet a different vantage point, Thiessen (1989: 290,291,293) structures the arguments of five recent teacher development publications according to who should make decisions (power), how teachers should improve their practices (professional learning), and how they should influence their workplace (environment):

1. Power - Teachers should be involved in decisions that affect the content and strategies of their development. Through a more participatory role in decision making, teachers should:

- increase the level of their influence;
- use a rich and varied knowledge base;
- negotiate preferred directions with educators who have some stake in the ways in which teachers improve their practices.

2. Professional Learning - Teachers should engage in ongoing reflective, collaborative, and inquiry-oriented approaches. Such approaches should involve teachers in experiences which:

- respond and adapt to their personal and practical realities;
- examine changing practices rigorously and in depth;
- consider the consequences of changes for their classrooms, schools and communities;
- require some collegial endeavour to apply and evaluate the new practices.

3. Environment - Teachers should build an enabling workplace, one that is a learning place for everyone. They should:

- examine how the context interacts with their beliefs and practices;
- increasingly shape if not manage the norms and conditions in their workplace;
- simultaneously develop their individual and collective capacity for change.

The above suggestions reconstrue the literature on effective INSET to emphasize the priorities of the primary stakeholders, the teachers. In this *micro* framework, the particular world of teachers guides the programatic, organizational, and cultural conditions necessary for teacher development.

When reduced to a list, earlier recommendations for effective INSET are not substantially different from more recent guidelines. For example, teacher involvement, collegial, and structural support, and opportunity and licence to adapt new practices are critical features in most successful past and present approaches. Today, the subtle and complex relationship between personal and contextual variability receives greater notice. Increasingly, different notions concerning INSET effectiveness are also understood in terms of alternative perspectives in teacher development.

Alternative INSET Perspectives

The effective application of the above guidelines can lead to productive INSET practices but in different ways and with different results. Human and situational variability explain some of the diversity. At a more fundamental level, however, differences in assumptions and values are at the root of our varied views on "what works".

Numerous typologies exist which directly or indirectly represent alternative INSET perspectives. Miller and Seller (1985) describe three curriculum world views which incorporate professional development orientations. The world views include:
Transmission - where the function of education is to pass on facts, skills, and values. Professional development activities emphasize formal sessions, with varied motivational strategies, information technology, and practical demonstrations.
Transaction - where education structures the development of rational processes to solve problems. Professional development activities emphasize more interactive approaches with cycles of practice, feedback, and coaching.
Transformation - where education facilitates integrated and personal social change. Professional development activities emphasize personal growth, within a sense of community.

Eraut (1987:733) identifies four INSET paradigms:

Defect - Teachers need to replace obsolete practices or to improve their basic competencies in response to changing priorities in the curriculum.
Change - Educational system, as one of the major social institutions in society, must organize or re-structure its system to new realities of society.
Problem solving - Teachers in the context of their dominant institutional environment, the school, must work together to resolve the complex problems that inevitably arise in their classrooms and school.
Growth - Each teacher engages in an ongoing process of development through experiences, reflection, and collegial interaction.

The paradigms are differentiated according to the goal (improvement - problem solving, defect; redirection - growth, change) and the source of development (internal to the teacher or school - problem solving, growth; external to teacher or school - defect, change).

A third example of portraying alternative INSET perspectives is Hunt's (1987) distinction between "inside-out" and "outside-in" approaches to staff development. Inside-out approaches begin with an individual's experience and build through reciprocal, responsive, and reflexive situations. In contrast, outside-in approaches begin with the theorist-as-expert and the practitioner-as-consumer and follow with unilateral, fixed, and objective strategies. Each approach assumes a different position concerning the source of knowledge (inside or outside the experience of teachers) and concerning the authority to direct teacher development (experts/administrators or teachers).

Regardless of the label, the categories within each typology are distinguishable by their stances on the scope of teacher participation, the nature of professional learning, and the image of the teacher. Most perspectives support the involvement of teachers in their own education but differ on the extent of their participation. Some (for example, the defect paradigm) restrict the activity of teachers to following directions, periodically offering input or consultation on procedural matters. Conversely, others (for example, the inside-out approach) place teachers at the centre of any development initiative; in this perspective, teachers are not "inserviced" but have and create opportunities to be inquiring and learning individuals observing, reflecting on and discussing practice, and trying out new ideas.

Perspectives are generally divided into transfer and generative notions of professional learning. A transfer view of professional development searches for validated practices which teachers are capable of learning through systematic training and application. Professional learning depends on the accurate calculation of which activities will produce the greatest difference in student achievement and teacher development in the greatest number of classrooms. From a generative viewpoint, in contrast, professional learning occurs within the daily realities of classroom life. Teachers determine those experiences that will help them harness the insights and capabilities from 'within'. In their efforts to make the implicit explicit, to question the taken-for-granted, to interro-gate the obvious, and challenge the givens, teachers generate the substance and path of their own learning (Thiessen, 1989).

Who should teachers learn to be? Underlying an INSET activity is a particular image of teacher. Learning to use the lessons of INSET in effect is accepting to live by a specific set of assumptions and values. Implicit in the different perspectives are at least two images: *teacher as steward and teacher as reformer* (Thiessen and Kilcher, 1993).

In many INSET activities, teachers are taught in ways which enhance their roles as stewards. As the local school representatives of the state, stewards are purveyor of policy, enculturating students with social norms and inducting them into the knowledge and skills necessary for effective participation in life's endeavours. Teachers adopt various roles -environmental manager, strategist, translator, quality controller, and artisan - to fulfil their responsibility for improving student learning and school effectiveness.

The vision of *teachers as stewards* follows a tradition which seeks excellence in classroom and school practices. Stewards work in a hierarchical system in which one level sets up the conditions for the level beneath it. They receive, with some license to influence and adapt, the framework of expectations and procedures governing the school, and in turn, organize the rules and routine guiding their classrooms. Stewards improve their skills, knowledge, and attitudes through the systematic application of proven instructional and school development strategies. Effectiveness in their job depends on the accurate assessment of need, the consistent matching of method to objective, and the careful attention to standards in the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs and practices.

Other INSET activities endorse and promote an image of *teachers as reformers*. As primary architects of their own classroom and school practices, reformers interrelate such stances as activist, deliberator, meaning and culture maker, partner, and explorer. They are the moral practitioners of educational change. They work, learn, and make decisions with their colleagues and students. While valuing diversity, teachers as reformers find bonds which bring people and their ideas together. In dynamic and interactive classrooms and school cultures, reformers transform instrumental concerns with what works into considerations of personal, educational, and social meaning. Individual and collective understanding comes from the ongoing creation of experience, shared discovery, and mutual critique. Each stakeholder is part of some reforms but teachers are a part of every reform.

The addition of alternative INSET perspectives creates a more comprehensive framework for understanding and engaging in INSET approaches. We must consider not only empirically proven but also philosophically justifiable practices. Doing what's best or what works simultaneously raises questions concerning our assumptions about and justifications for *best* and *works*. How teachers practice their INSET perspectives matters to the meaning and form of success in the Transition Years Project.

Informing The Transition Years Project

At the most obvious level, the INSET literature offers a set of questions to frame the study:

- What alternative INSET approaches are available through the literature?
- What is their impact?
- What is the dominant perspective in practice?

The literature gives us some reference points enabling us to situate the approaches along the spectrum of INSET practices, to relate observations of impact to known guidelines for effective professional development, and to identify the underlying assumptions and values of these approaches.

Indepth comparisons between the INSET literature and the INSET experiences of those involved in Transition Years pilot initiatives however, exposes diversity in relation to ideas reported in previous studies. Personal, contextual, and especially perspectival variability make these discrepancies inevitable. Repeatedly asking the question, "Why do teachers engage in INSET practices in particular ways?" will allow us to probe their embedded assumptions about the socio-political location, learning experiences, and image of teachers. The literature on perspectives anticipates the importance of these assumptions to understanding variations in INSET approaches.

Finally, when INSET becomes school-based and teacher-centred, distinctions between teaching and learning how to teach are less significant. Consequently, we can also develop insights into INSET experiences by attending to teaching practices.

Notes

1. Much of this section and parts of the section, **ALTERNATIVE INSET PERSPECTIVES**, are based on Thiessen and Kilcher (1993).

2. Earlier work in such large-scale projects as the Rand Study (M^{c}Laughlin and Marsh, 1978) and the Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project (Joyce et al.,1976) set the foundation for subsequent positions on effective inservice practices. The "review of reviews" also examined Arends et al.,(1980), Bolam (1982), Dillon - Peterson (1981), Eraut (1972), Fullan (1982), Howey and Vaughn (1983), Houston and Pankratz (1980), Hutson (1981), Lawerence (1981), Mertons (1982), and Wood and Thompson (1980).

References

Ackland, R. (1991). A review of the peer coaching literature. *Journal of staff Development, 12*(1), 22-27.

Arends, T. (et al., 1980). *Conditions for promoting effective staff development.* Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1991) *Report of the Commission on the Education of Teachers into the 21st Century.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within. Teachers, parents, and principals can make a difference.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolam, R. (1982). *In-service education and training of teachers.* Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Bradley, H. (1991). *Staff development.* London: Falmer Press.

Calderhead, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Teachers' professional learning.* London: Falmer Press.

Caldwell, S. (Ed.) (1989). *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices.* Oxford, Oh: National Staff Development Council.

Carson, T., & Couture, J.C. (1988). *Collaborative action research: Experiences and reflections.* Improvement of Instruction Series, Monograph Number 18. Edmonton, Alberta: The Alberta Teachers' Association.

Clark, R.W. (1988). School-university partnerships: An interpretative review. In Sirotnik, K.A., & Goodlad, J.I. (Eds.), *School-university partnerships: Partners in Action.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Clift, R., Houston, R., & Pugach, M. (1990). *Encouraging reflective practice: An examination of issues and exemplars.* New York: Teacher College Press.

Cole, A.L. (1990). Helping teachers become "real": Opportunities in teacher induction. *Journal of Staff Development, 11*(4), 6-10.

Cole, A.L., & McNay, M. (1988). Induction programs in Ontario schools: Issues and possibilities. *Education Canada, 28*(4), 4-11, 44-45.

Cole, A.L., & Watson, N. (1991). Teacher induction [Theme issue]. *Orbit, 22*(5).

Connelly, F.M., & Clandinin, D.J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Diamond, C.T.P. (1991). *Teacher education ad transformation.* London: Open University Press.

Dillon-Peterson, (B. Ed.) (1981). *Staff development/organization Development.* Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Doyle, W. (1990). Themes in teacher education research. In R. Houston, J.Sikula, & M. Haberman (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 6-22). New York: Macmillan.

Elmore, R.F., & Associates. (1990). *Restructuring schools. The next generation of educational reform.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eraut, M. (1987). Inservice teacher education. In M. Dunkin (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education.* New York: Pergamon Press.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (1989). The nature of Professional Development Schools. *ERIC Digest,4.*

Flanders, T., & Wilson, D. (1990). *Teaching comes of age: Responding to the challenges of change.* A report of the Task Force on Teaching Conditions and Professional Practices. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Teachers' Foundation.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies In Education Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* Toronto: OISE Press, and New York: Teacher College Press.

Fullan, M. (in press). *Productive educational change.* London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for in the school.* Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers Federation.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.) (1992). *Teacher development and educational change.* London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M., Rolheiser-Bennett, C., & Bennett, B. (1990). Linking classroom and school improvement. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 13-19.

Glatthorn, A. (1987). Cooperative professional development: Peer-centred options for teacher growth. *Educational Leadership, 45*, 31-35.

Grimmett, P., & Erickson, G.L. (Eds.) (1988). *Reflection in teacher education.* Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (Eds.) (in press). *Understanding teacher development.* London: Routledge.

Haysom, I. (1985). *Inquiry into the teaching process: Towards self-evaluation and professional development.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Holly, M.L. (1989). *Writing to grow: Keeping a personal-professional journal.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Holly, M.L., and McLoughlin, C.S. (Eds.) (1989). *Perspectives on teacher professional development.* London: Falmer Press.

Holly, P., & Southworth, G. (1989). *The developing school.* London: Falmer Press.

Houston, R. and Pankratz, T., (Eds.) (1980). *Staff development and educational change.* Washington: Association of Teacher Education.

Houston, R., Sikula, J., & Haberman, M. (Eds.) (1990). *Handbook of research on teacher education.* New York: Macmillan.

Howey, K. and Vaughan, J. (1983). "Current patterns of staff Development" in G. Griffin, (Ed.) *Staff development, Part II.* 82nd Yearbook of National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 92-117.

Hoyle, E., & Megarry, J. (Eds.) (1980). *Professional development of teachers: World yearbook of education.* London: Kagan Page Ltd.

Hunt, D.E. (1987). *Beginning with ourselves: In practice, theory, and human affairs.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Hutson, H. (1981). "Inservice best practices: The learnings of general education." *Journal of Research and Development In Education, 14*(2), 1-10.

Joyce, B. (Ed.) (1990). *Changing school culture through staff development.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kilbourn, B. (1990). *Constructive feedback. Learning the art. The story of Oliver and Taylor.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lawerence, G. (1981). *A synthesis of research of the effectiveness of staff development programs.* Paper presented at the State of Ohio, Department of Education Annual Conference on Inservice Education, ED 211499.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.) (1988). *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (Ed.) (in press). *Staff development* (2nd edition). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.) (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now.* London: Falmer Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miler, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. *Teachers College Record, 92*(1), 105-122.

Liston, D.P., & Zeichner, K.M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Little, J.W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In V. Koehler (Ed.), *Educator's handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 491-518). New York: Longman.

Little, J.W. (1990b). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers' College Record, 91*(4), 509-536.

Livingston, C. (1991). *Teacher leadership.* Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C.K., Arbuckle, M.A., Murray, L.B., Dubea, C., Williams, M.K., (1987). *Continuing to learn: A guidebook to teacher development.* Andover: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands and Oxford: The National Staff Development Council.

Louis, K.S., & Miles, M., (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Marsh, C., Day, C., Hannay, L., & McCutcheon, G., (Eds.) (1990). *Reconceptualizing school-based curriculum development.* London: Falmer Press.

Mertens, S. (1982). "The basics in inservice education: Findings from the rand and teacher centre studies". *Action In Teacher Education, IV*(1), 61-66.

Miller, J.P., & Seller, W. (1986). *Curriculum. Perspectives and practice.* New York: Longman.

Oberg, A. (1989). Supervision as a creative act. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5*(1), 60-69.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1985). *Professional development practices.* Provincial Review Report, Number 6. Toronto, Ontario.

Park,P., & Fullan, M. (1986). *Issues of professional development: Ontario curriculum 1986.* Toronto: Ontario Teachers' Federation.

Pollard, A., & Tann, S. (1987). *Reflective teaching in the primary school: A handbook for the classroom.* London: Cassell.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Rudduck, J. (1991). *Innovation and change.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Schon, D. (1991). *Cases in reflective practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. *Educational Leadership, 42*(7), 43-48.

Sirotnik, K.A., & Goodlad, J.I. (Eds.) (1988). *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Smylie, M., & Conyers, J.(1991). Changing conceptions of teaching influence the future of staff development. *Journal of Staff Development, 12*(1), 12-16.

Smyth, J. (Ed.) (1987). *Educating teachers: Changing the nature of pedagogical knowledge.* London: Falmer Press.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. *Journals of Staff Development, 10*(4), 40-57.

Thiessen, D. (1989a). Alternative perspectives on teacher development. *Journal of Education Policy, 4*(3), 289-295.

Thiessen, D. (1989b). Teachers and their curriculum-change orientations. In G. Milburn, I. Goodson, & R. Clark (Eds.). *Reinterpreting curriculum research: Images and arguments* (pp. 132-143). London: Falmer Press and London, ONT: Althouse Press.

Thiessen, D., & Kilcher, A. (1993). *Innovations in Teacher Education: A review of recent literature.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Tisher, R.P., & Wideen, M.F. (Eds.) (1990). *Research in teacher education.* London: Falmer Press.

Tuinman, J., & Brayne, R. (1988). *The on-site personnel who facilitate learning.* Commissioned Papers: Volume 4. Victoria, BC: British Columbia Royal Commission on Education.

Watson, N., & Kilcher, C.A. (1990). *Peer coaching: A review of literature and a glimpse of Ontario practice.* Toronto: Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation.

Wideen, M.F. (1988). School improvement in Canada. *International Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, 1*(1), 21-38.

Wideen, M.F., & Andrews, I. (1987). *Staff development for school improvement: A focus on the teacher.* London: Falmer Press.

Wodlinger, M.G. (Ed.) (1989a). *Current research in teacher education in Canada.* North Bay, Ont.: Nipissing University College.

Wodlinger, M.G. (Ed.) (1989b). *Collaborative action research in Canadian teacher education*. Proceedings form the third invitational conference of the Canadian Association of Teacher Education. North Bay, Ont.: Nipissing University College.

Wood, F. & Thompson, S. (1980). "Guidelines for better staff development" *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 374-378.

Zeichner, K.M., & Liston, D. P. (1990). Traditions of reform in U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2), 3-20.

3.
School Organization: How Should Students be Grouped for Instruction in the Transition Years?

Kenneth Leithwood

Few educational policy issues have stirred more controversy in Ontario (King, 1990), as well as in many other jurisdictions, over the past half dozen years than how students should be grouped for instruction --"streaming" being one form of such grouping. The issue acquired particular force in debates about the direction of educational restructuring as the practice of ability grouping began to be conceived, not only as a matter of effectiveness but one of equity as well. Conceptualized in this way, ability grouping was joined with gender, language, ethnicity, and religion as one component of what promises to be the preeminant social policy agenda item of the 1990's.

Recent attention notwithstanding, the practice of ability grouping in schools is at least a century old in North America. Kulik and Kulik (1982) date its inception in the United States to St. Louis in 1867. Research concerning the effects of ability grouping has a long history also. Whipple reported the first study of homogeneous grouping in the United States in 1916; the 1936 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education contained one literature review with 108 research citations (Kulik & Kulik, 1982).

Interestingly, from the earliest to the most recent reviews of this body of research, the conclusion has always been that nothing has been established with certainty about the effects of ability grouping, in general. The persistence of this conclusion raises several intriguing issues which are addressed by way of concluding the present review. Four questions serve as the primary focus of this review:

- How extensive is student ability grouping in schools serving students in the transition years and what are the reasons for such grouping?

- What alternative forms of ability grouping are typically used and what are the effects on students of these alternatives?

- How can the observed effects on students of alternative forms of ability grouping be explained?

- What implications for exemplary practice are warranted by the research on grouping students for instruction in the transition years?

Evidence Used For The Review

Because research on ability grouping is vast in quantity and spread over the better part of a century, the selection of literature which would adequately represent its conclusions presented a significant problem. Criteria considered relevant in assembling the body of literature, as a whole, were fourfold. This literature needed to: a) reflect the best quality empirical evidence available; b) be sensitive to outstanding areas of controversy among those in the research community, and c) be relevant to the context of schooling in the 1990's.

The nature of the research project, of which this review was a part, also dictated that the research selected emphasize grouping practices and their effects on students in the transition years, in particular. Applying these criteria to the large quantity of citations resulting from electronic (ERIC) and manual bibliographic searches resulted in the choice of 32 "studies." These studies were of five distinct types:

- *Quantitative Reviews of Research:* these reviews, known as meta-analyses, combine data from a corpus of original studies and treat them (more, or less) like data from a single study. An "effect size" statistic is calculated. Three such meta-analyses were included (Kulik & Kulik, 1982; Slavin, 1987(a); Slavin 1990 (a)).

- *Critiques of Quantitative Reviews:* five papers included critical commentary on the methods used in, and conclusions drawn from, the Slavin (1987(a), 1990(a)) reviews as well as rejoinders by Slavin (Hallinan, 1990; Heibert, 1987; Gamoran, 1987; Slavin, 1987(b); Slavin 1990(b)).

- *Narrative Reviews of Research:* this type of research review focuses on the number of studies reporting similar results, often drawing conclusions based on a "box score" (e.g., 15 studies for, 3 against). Such reviews typically attend to theory, explanation and reasoned argument more than do quantitative reviews. Six narrative reviews were included (Murphy & Hallinger, 1989; George, 1988; Scarborough Board of Education, 1989; Feldhusen, 1989; Spencer & Allen, 1989; Slavin, 1988; Gamoran & Berends, 1987).

- *Original Studies of Student Grouping in Transition Years:* these original studies were not included in any of the three quantitative or six narrative reviews. Ten in number, they explored important issues involved in student grouping exclusively in the transition years (Dar, 1985; Braddock, 1990; Low, 1988; Reuman, et al., 1983; Webb, 1984; Webb & Cullian, 1983; Skov, 1986; Evertson, Sanford & Emmer, 1981; Sorensen & Hallinan, 1986; Hargreaves et al, 1992).

- *Reflections on Policy and Practice:* eight papers selected for inclusion addressed implications for school policy and practice arising from research on student ability grouping (Junyk, 1990; Swarzbough, 1986; Braddock & McPortland, 1990; Jung, 1990; Goodlad & Oakes, 1988; Watson, 1985; Nevi, 1987; Oakes, 1992; Wheelock, 1992).

In the interests of succinctness and readability, subsequent sections of the chapter do not identify systematically which of the 32 studies, described above, is the source of each claim or bit of information discussed. Suffice to say that such claims or information are reflected in more than just two or three of the 29 studies, unless otherwise indicated.

Due primarily to the method used for identifying research sources, the evidence available for review was overwhelmingly North American. This is an important limitation; significant literatures on student organization have also developed outside of North America.

How Extensive is Ability Grouping and Why is It Used?

The prevalence of organizing transition years students, for instructional purposes, in groups of similar ability is evident in a synopsis of the results of a recent nation-wide survey conducted in U.S. schools by John Hopkins University:

> The use of between-class ability grouping in the middle grades is widespread: roughly two-thirds of the middle-grade principals surveyed reported that their schools use the practice in at least some academic subjects, while more than one-fifth said that their schools do so in all subjects.... Although the regrouping of students for instruction is not uncommon, between one-third and one-half of all middle grade students remain with the same classmates all day. (Braddock, 1990, p.449)

While comparable data were not located for Canada, other evidence suggests that ability grouping is nearly universal in some form in the middle and senior grades and very common in elementary schools. Ontario secondary school curriculum policy (O.S.I.S.), designating courses as advanced, general and basic, clearly goes some distance toward guaranteeing that such will be the case in Ontario.

The prevalence of homogeneous ability grouping conforms to the preferences of the majority of teachers. Surveys conducted on this issue typically indicate about a 75 percent approval rate. Three sets of reasons are offered in the literature for the practice: better instruction, consistency with the traditional educational philosophy of many teachers, and the practical value of student grouping under normal school conditions.

Expectations of Better Instruction: One set of reasons centres on the expectation of improved instruction. Ability grouping should lead to better instruction, it is argued, because similarities in academic background and learning rates increase the amount of time that can be spent productively on direct, whole-class forms of instruction. Further, when high achieving students are grouped together, they should be motivated by the stimulation of their peers to work harder. Teachers will also be able to increase the pace and level of instruction beyond what would be appropriate with a heterogeneous group, thereby covering larger quantities of more complex material. Groups of lower ability students, so this argument goes, are more

effectively managed; also, they can be provided with more individual attention, repetition and review. Because, these less able students do not have to compete with their more academically able peers, standards of achievement can be modified with the resulting reduction in failure and the lowered self-esteem accompanying such failure (teachers' liability for student failure is also reduced).

Since the experience of school failure is a primary reason for dropping out, ability grouping is also considered to be a strategy for encouraging students to stay in school longer.

Traditional Educational Philosophies: A second set of reasons for explaining the predominance of homogeneous ability grouping, focuses on differences among teachers with respect to basic educational philosophies and related beliefs and practices. Teachers who espouse a "traditional" educational philosophy are more oriented to subject matter and academic achievement:

> Accordingly, they seek selective frameworks for able students who then set norms for the whole system. Their view of intelligence, as an irreversible trait strongly determined by heredity, also justifies the separation of slow learners. (Dar, 1985, p. 17)

Teachers holding such traditional educational philosophies also tend to emphasize the importance of their own role and to undervalue the importance of the learning group in providing information. Hence, such teachers may be insensitive to the detrimental effects of ability grouping on the less able students who find themselves in a less stimulating intellectual environment.

As Dar points out:

> ...a teacher who prefers traditional instruction will tend to consider the pupil-teacher relationship more important, while one who relies on group activity and individual work will likely stress the pupil-peer relationship. (1985, p. 19)

Hence, the use of traditional teaching methods is likely to be associated with more positive views about homogeneous ability grouping of students.

An interesting paradox is evident in comparing the two sets of reasons for ability grouping discussed to this point. Depending on which perspective is adopted, ability grouping is viewed as either the stimulus for instructional change or the structural manifestation of traditional teaching methods.

Pragmatic Value: A third set of reasons offered for ability grouping stresses its pragmatic value under normal classroom and school conditions (e.g., large class sizes, limited preparation time for teachers, and expectations of parents). This argument incorporates the claim that such grouping promotes learning, but not necessarily by directly changing teaching methods. First, it is claimed, the disparity between the majority of teachers' preferences for ability grouping and the indifferent effects of such grouping on student outcomes, reported in the research, can be explained by superior teacher knowledge. This knowledge is about not just the broad range of student learning for which real schools are responsible but also the contexts of teaching. Results of research are a product of narrowly focussed, insensitive measures of student achievement--most often, standardized achievement tests. In contrast, it is argued, teachers have available highly sensitive, multi-facetted, longitudinal sources of information. Furthermore, such information is about not only student outcomes but also classroom processes, something to which researchers have devoted little attention in relation to ability grouping. Since teachers are largely motivated by the best interests of their students (and there is considerable evidence on this point), the popularity of ability grouping is powerful testimony to its practical value in promoting student growth under typical (imperfect) classroom and school conditions.

Subsequent sections of this chapter challenge the validity of several of the claims in this argument. Nevertheless, it is an argument not to be dismissed lightly.

In sum, the homogeneous ability grouping of transition years students is extensive. Its widespread use can be explained by: (a) the common belief that ability grouping leads to better focussed instruction; (b) traditional educational philosophies and practices of the majority of teachers; and (c) the utility of ability grouping (quite aside from whether it leads to better focussed instruction) in fostering student growth across a broad array of objectives under the imperfect conditions typically found in real classrooms and schools.

What Forms of Student Ability Grouping are Used and What is Their Effect?

In the previous section, the effects of ability grouping, as reported in the research literature, were described generally as "uncertain" and "indifferent." While these terms accurately reflect the overall effects of homogeneous student grouping practices, more detailed analyses reveal distinctions of significant consequence for policy and practice in the transition years. Variables giving rise to these distinctions include type of student outcome, type of student, and method of student grouping.

The impact of homogeneous student grouping has been studied in relation to a number of areas of achievement, among them mathematics, reading, writing, vocabulary, science, social studies and civics. Also examined, has been the impact of ability grouping on such affective dimensions as self-concept, self-esteem, attitude toward subject matter, and attitude toward school. Research focussed on ability grouping in secondary schools has inquired about its effects on students' expectations regarding their future school careers (whether or not they expect to go to college) and their actual school attainment.

In general, across all types of students and grouping arrangements, homogeneous ability grouping appears to have:

- mixed to modest positive effects on achievement. These effects appear to be greatest in subjects with a strong hierarchical structure (e.g., mathematics, science), English and foreign languages. Heterogeneous grouping seems most beneficial in social studies, history and other subjects which benefit from multiple perspectives;

- medium, positive effects on attitudes toward subject matter;

- zero to quite small, positive effects on self-concept, self-esteem and attitudes toward school;

- significant effects on expectations about future schooling and actual enrollment in college.

Much of the research on the effects of ability grouping has distinguished among students who, on the basis of I.Q. scores and/or previous school achievement, were classified as having high, moderate or low academic ability. Without taking into account distinctions among the forms of homogeneous grouping, these results suggest that ability grouping has:

- modest advantages for the achievement of high ability students (the overall modest, positive effects of ability grouping are a function of ability grouping's effects on this type of student alone);

- small, negative effects on the achievement of students with moderate and low academic ability; such students learn as well or better in heterogeneous classes;

- similar effects on affective outcomes (such as attitudes toward subject matter) for all types of students.

Homogeneous grouping takes many forms. At the secondary level, between-class ability groupings are most common; within-class ability groupings are most common in elementary schools. Between-class ability groupings include "tracking" or "streaming"--the assignment of students to a program (e.g., academic, vocational, general) in which they take most or all of their courses. Ontario's policy of designating courses as advanced, general, and basic was intended to allow students to choose courses across a range of levels determined by intra-individual variation in ability. In practice, however, most students take most of their courses at only one level and moving up levels after experiencing significant success at lower levels has proven to be very difficult. Tracking in senior secondary schools usually involves different courses or course requirements.

Another form of between-class grouping is block scheduling. This form, common in the transition years, involves students spending all or most of the school day with one homogeneous group. A variant on such scheduling keeps students together for most of the day but reassigns them on the basis of level of difficulty for one or several subjects. Special education and gifted programs are two other forms of between-class ability grouping.

There is insufficient research available to draw general conclusions about the effects of each of these forms of ability grouping. However, it is possible to conclude that:

- there are clear achievement gains for students assigned to high/academic tracks as compared with those assigned to other tracks;

- assignment to an academic track has positive effects on students' expectations to continue to college; these students are also more likely to actually attend college;

- students assigned to some type of gifted program demonstrate significant achievement advantages; accelerated classes may provide greater advantages than enrichment classes for these students;

- separating students with learning difficulties into special classes is not as helpful to them as accommodating their difficulties within a regular, heterogeneous class.

While commonest in elementary schools, within-class ability grouping occurs at all levels. Evidence suggests that:

- within-class ability grouping is probably most successful for students of all ability levels in mathematics; not enough research has been carried out in other areas to draw conclusions with much confidence;

- non-graded arrangements, commonest in elementary schools, show inconsistent but generally positive effects on achievement and attitudes.

In sum, the case for between-class homogeneous ability grouping in the transition years is likely strongest for students of high academic ability. For these students, modest achievement gains and more ambitious educational plans for the future are the most likely outcomes. For other students, very limited within-class ability grouping, especially for mathematics and possibly reading, may be of some advantage. But involvement in a heterogeneous group for the majority of their time is likely to be most productive for them. When these students are grouped by

ability for instruction, it should be under conditions which: (a) reduce heterogeneity in the specific skill being taught; (b) include frequent reassessment and flexible group assignment, and (c) adapt the pace and level of instruction in regrouped classes to accommodate students' levels of readiness and learning rates.

How Can the Effects of Homogeneous Ability Grouping be Explained?

Although homogeneous ability grouping, in one form or another, is practiced extensively in the transition years, its effects on achievement and a variety of attitudinal outcomes are modest, at best, as discussed above. Indeed, the positive effects of ability grouping accrue largely to high ability students whereas the effects on medium and low ability students tend to be neutral or negative. From this perspective, the effects of ability grouping are the same as the effects of inflation--the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

How these consequences of ability grouping come about warrant careful attention, especially since one of the main arguments for ability grouping is that it is more likely to provide instruction better designed to meet the needs of different groups of students. Evidence included in the present review suggests that, while this likely occurs for high ability students, precisely the opposite occurs for medium and (especially) low ability students. This evidence, drawn from the work of Murphy and Hallinger (1989), is presented in three categories; instruction, curriculum, and learning environments.

Instruction: Research has compared the instruction provided high ability groups and/or students in academic tracks with the instruction provided to lower ability students and/or those in general and basic tracks. Results of this research are revealing about both teachers and instructional processes. As compared with teachers of academic track/high ability students, teachers of lower track/ability students:

- are less well qualified and often regarded as less successful;
- have less interest in working with the students to whom they are assigned;
- feel less knowledgeable about how to prepare for, and conduct classes for the lower ability students;

- spend less time preparing for their classes and set less demanding standards for their own teaching;
- are less warm and enthusiastic with their students.

As compared with academic track/high ability groups, the instructional process experienced by lower track/ability groups is:

- slower paced;
- interrupted or eroded more frequently by behaviour control, classroom management interventions resulting in less time on task;
- less interactive, with more time spent on seatwork and other individual, often low level, repetitive tasks;
- less sequential and integrated;
- less likely to include assigned homework;
- less likely to provide constructive academic feedback;
- less likely to test as frequently;
- less varied.

Curriculum: Evidence regarding the curriculum experienced by students in lower tracks/ability groups focuses on opportunities to learn academic content. As compared with the curriculum for academic track/high ability peers, the curriculum for these students:

- emphasizes lower level, more "functional" skills;
- especially under streaming arrangements, usually requires fewer academic courses be taken and courses that are less likely to build on one another;
- provides fewer opportunities to learn academic content and often trades off rigorous encounters with this content for compliance with classroom routines and non-disruptive behaviour.

Learning Environment: The classroom curriculum is experienced by students in the context of a culture or learning environment which may indirectly, subtley, and implicitly, as well as directly and overtly, reinforce serious efforts toward understanding. Evidence suggests that such a learning environment is often part of the context of academic tracks and/or high ability groups. In contrast, the learning environment of lower tracks or ability groups is more likely to be characterized by:

- negative and inappropriate expectations from adults in areas of both student behaviour and academic performance;
- weaker classroom structures and routines--more chaos;
- more ambiguity regarding the purposes for classroom activity;
- less cohesive student groups less likely to work cooperatively with peers;
- less bonding to the school by students.

In sum, the substantially different effects of homogeneous ability grouping on higher and lower ability student groups can be explained in the context of what Murphy and Hallinger refer to as a "third generation" (1989, p.130) definition of equity--equity as access to knowledge. By this definition, equity is *not* achieved by ensuring that all students receive the same instruction, the same level of resources and the like. Some students have different needs, some have greater needs. This argues for achieving equality through differentiation of the school experience, the same argument used in defense of homogeneous ability grouping.

The challenge, then, lies not with the interpretation of the problem but rather the solution. *As implemented*, ability grouping turns out to be what Sam Seiber (1976) refers to as a "fatal remedy"--a solution which exacerbates rather than alleviates the problem. For those students with the greatest needs, homogeneous ability grouping in many schools results in poorer instruction delivered by less well-prepared teachers in the context of a curriculum providing fewer opportunities to master academic content and an environment less supportive of efforts to understand.

Discussion and Implications for Exemplary Practice

Discussion

There remains considerable debate regarding the impact of ability grouping. For example, Slavin (1990a) concludes his review by asserting his confidence in the lack of advantage to students' achievement of between-class or other forms of grouping: he believes that such grouping is equally ineffective in all subjects and that its effects on achievement are negative in social studies. Hallinan's (1990) critique of the

Slavin (1990a) review, however, suggests that it ignores research of a sociological type showing that ability grouping favours high ability students and disadvantages students of lower ability. Results of the present review are closer to the Hallinan than to the Slavin position.

How much importance one attaches to these findings depends, on at least two matters: the value one attributes to equality of access to knowledge as an educational goal; and the significance one attaches to the size of the effects attributed to ability grouping. Let's consider each of these matters in turn.

Equality of access to knowledge--Murphy and Hallinger's (1989) "third generation" definition of it--is espoused as a goal in curriculum policies throughout Canada. It is especially evident in the educational platform of the New Democratic government in Ontario. The introduction to this chapter, in fact, claimed that ability grouping had joined with gender, language, ethnicity and religion as one component of the preeminant social policy agenda of the 1990's. To the extent that one agrees that this is the case--and schools can hardly afford not to--practices which are suspect on equity grounds are clearly ripe for reform. Indeed, Slavin who, as we have seen, attributes little achievement advantage or disadvantage of ability grouping to any students is sufficiently convinced of the importance of the equity issue to claim that:

> ...the burden of proof is on those who favour grouping for if grouping is not found to be clearly more effective than heterogeneous placement, none of the pro-grouping arguments apply. The same is not true of anti-grouping arguments which provide a rationale for abolishing grouping that would be plausible even if grouping were found to have no adverse effects on achievement. (1990a, p.474)

While equity has been argued as a crucial goal on ethical grounds, there are also legal implications involved in ability grouping when it disadvantages the opportunities of some students. The outcomes of a number of legal challenges make this clear in the U.S. context. As yet, there have been no legal challenges to streaming or tracking in Canada. But Junyk's (1990) analysis of Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Section 15) suggests that the practice is legally vulnerable to the extent that there is:

- a disproportionate placement of poor and minority students in general and basic streams;
- limited access of lower track groups to higher education;
- permanence of tracking classifications;
- reduced quality of instruction in lower tracks;
- misclassification of students due to inappropriate diagnostic processes.

The size of the effects of ability grouping on achievement, attitudes and other outcomes vary enormously across individual studies but on the whole are relatively modest. For example, Kulik and Kulik's review of 52 studies of ability grouping in secondary schools suggested that the benefits from grouping were "an average increase in one-tenth of a standard deviation on exam scores, or an increase from the 50th to the 54th percentile for the typical student in a grouped class" (1982, p.415). This effect compares, for example with a quarter standard deviation increase that can be expected from simply assigning homework (Walberg, 1984). Under typical circumstances, then, the decision to group students homogeneously or heterogeneously has much less to do with achievement and attitudinal outcomes than do a host of other decisions, principally those regarding the processes experienced by students once the grouping decision has been made. Indeed, if equity were not such a critical concern, one might be tempted to brand the whole ability grouping controversy a "tempest in a teapot." Of course, equity is a critical concern and the circumstances under which students are grouped need not be "typical."

Implications for Exemplary Practice

Sarason (1990) claims that one of the central reasons for the predictable failure of school reform has been our failure to consider schools as systems. Changes are initiated in those aspects of the school that have direct effects on students' experiences - forms of instruction, curriculum materials, assessment practices and student grouping arrangements, for example. Such "first-order" changes most obviously impact on students and are an attractive focus for the attention of school staffs. For these reasons we often fail to recognize that these changes are taking up residence in a larger cultural, administrative, organizational and political school context designed to support the practices these changes are replacing. Such contexts can be decidedly inhospitable to the new practices unless they are also changed.

Making such "second-order" changes acknowledges schools as systems, in Sarason's (1990) terms.

Literature reviewed in this chapter so far has implications primarily for the first-order changes schools might consider making in their student grouping practices: in the first subsection below these implications are identified. However, the practical merits of these changes depend very much on whether they can be implemented in ways likely to realize the beneficial effects claimed for students in the research. This has quickly become the central problem for those many school staffs in the province who recognize the inequitable treatment received by students in a streamed system and would like to destream. The second subsection below summarizes what has been reported in the literature very recently about second-order changes to support destreaming; this includes a brief consideration of implementation processes.

Implications for first-order changes. Six first-order changes are suggested by our review of the student grouping literature.

1. Schools will need to adopt heterogeneous grouping of students as a norm.

Many analysts have correctly pointed out that simply "de-streaming" students will not result in much change in achievement and will involve significant adaptations in those many schools where homogeneous ability group is now the norm. Nevertheless, concerns about equity alone justify this as a goal toward which to move fairly rapidly.

2. Homogeneous ability grouping, when it is used, will need to be limited to:

- a small proportion of *any* students' total schedule;
- be provided to gifted students in one or two areas of especially high interest or aptitude;
- be provided to non-gifted students only in those areas in which they experience special difficulty.

3. **Procedures for allocating students to homogeneous groups will need to:**

   - be clearly understood and shared in common by all those involved in the allocation decision;
   - involve only criteria specifically related to the instructional purposes of the grouping arrangement;
   - incorporate explicit checks against bias in allocation decisions based on social status, ethnicity, gender and other qualities that challenge the equity of the allocation;
   - provide for frequent review of allocation decisions and reallocation as appropriate.

4. **Especially for lower ability groups of students, steps will need to be taken to:**

   - recruit for them the most talented teachers possible;
   - allocate more than average resources;
   - specifically adapt instruction to the needs of the group;
   - ensure that there is no erosion in the academic quality of the curriculum provided these students.

5. **Significant assistance will need to be provided to teachers responsible for classes with a much expanded range of abilities.**

Skov's (1986) study suggested that extra preparation time and relatively small class sizes were among the more helpful forms of assistance that could be provided transition years teachers of heterogeneous classes. Staff development opportunities are another form of assistance. For example, Evertson, Sanford and Emmer's (1981) research identified specific techniques used by teachers who coped well with highly heterogeneous classes (special attention and assistance to lower ability students; limited use of within-class grouping; differential grading practices; limited use of peer tutoring; frequent academic feedback; high levels of accountability for written work and class participation). Teachers require opportunities to become acquainted with the strategies found useful by successful teachers of heterogeneous classes.

6. **Teachers will need to be given special training in those instructional techniques designed especially to be used with heterogeneous groups of students.**

Similar to the previous recommendation in its concern for staff development, this recommendation is aimed specifically at instructional practices designed to foster student understanding, by taking advantage of heterogeneity. Goodlad and Oakes speak of students clustered in small groups exchanging ideas, helping one another learn, teachers not dominating the talk--rather acting as "orchestra conductors" getting things started, keeping them moving and "coordinating adverse but harmonious buzz of activity" (1988, p.19). Cooperative learning, team teaching and individualized evaluation are examples of specific techniques consistent with this recommendation.

Implications for second-order changes. A small number of recent publications have begun seriously to address the second-order changes that will be needed to make the larger cultural, administrative and organizational context of the school hospitable for destreaming (Hargreaves et al, 1992; Oakes, 1992; Wheelock, 1992). Using Oakes (1992) categories, this modest literature implies three types of second-order changes schools will need to consider.

7. **Schools will need to plan for the gradual but systematic introduction of a bundle of "technical" innovations largely consistent with the categories of practices associated with Transition Years initiatives.**

Providing diverse groups of students with access to a common body of knowledge (the fundamental purpose for destreaming) is likely to require changes toward a core curriculum, greater curriculum integration, new forms of student assessment that are less norm-referenced, and more individual support for students whose pace of learning is slower than average. But these changes cannot be introduced quickly requiring, as Wheelock (1992) points out, a multiyear plan to guide the change process in the school. Such a plan should be sensitive to the need for strong parent support and feature parents in school-level decision-making roles.

8. **Schools will need to successfully challenge a dominant set of beliefs held by some teachers, administrators and parents if destreaming is to take root.**

Destreaming is built on the belief that intelligence is malleable (rather than fixed and normally distributed across the population) and that it takes multiple forms: these are beliefs which find support, for example, in Caroll's (1963) long-standing model of school learning and Gardner's (1983) theory of multiple intelligences. Destreaming also rests on beliefs about the value of cooperation and the common good as distinct from competition and the good of the individual. Finally, destreaming eschews beliefs about achieving efficiency in human affairs, teaching and learning in this case, through bureaucratic forms of organization and the specialization of work, preferring instead more fluid, cross-hierarchical networks of relationships among people for the purpose of accomplishing large, meaningful tasks.

9. **Schools will need to develop or maintain collaborative work cultures in which the risks associated with changing practices are widely shared and in which opportunities for group problem solving are easily available.**

This implication is most evident in the recent Ontario study by Hargreaves et al (1992). Its realization is likely to require transformational school leadership, the sort of leadership described in more detail in Chapter 8 of this volume.

These implications for exemplary practice present significant challenges to school staffs and central office personnel providing support: they project optimism about what is possible without entirely dismantling school organizations as we know them. It is acceptable for the academically "rich to get richer." But it is not acceptable for the "poor" to continue to be educationally impoverished. There is no need to disadvantage any group of students in today's schools if only we will use what we know.

References

Braddock, J.H. (1990). Tracking the middle grades: National patterns of grouping for instruction. *Phi Delta Kappan*, February, 445-449.

Braddock, J.H.c & McPartland, J. (1990). Alternatives to tracking. *Educational Leadership*, 47(7), 76-79.

Carroll, J. (1963). A model of school learning. *Teachers College Record, 64*, 723-733.

Dar, Y. (1985). Teachers' attitudes toward ability grouping: Educational considerations and social and organizational influences. *Interchange, 16*(2), 17-38.

Epstein, J. (1990). Education in the middle grades: A national survey of practices and trends. *Phi Delta Kappan*, February, 436-437.

Evertson, C.M., Sanford, J.P., Emmer, E.T. (1981). Effects of class heterogeneity in junior high schools, *American Educational Research Journal, 18*(2), 219-232.

Feldhusen, J. (1989). Synthesis of research on gifted youth. *Educational Leadership, 46*(116), 6-11.

Gamoran, A. (1987). Organization, instruction and the effects of ability grouping: Comments on Slavin's "best-evidence synthesis," *Review of Educational Research, 57*(3), 341-346.

Gamoran, A. (1992). Is ability grouping equitable? *Educational Leadership, 50*(2), 11-17.

Gamoran, A., & Berends, M. (1987). The effects of stratification in secondary schools: Synthesis of survey and ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research, 57*(4), 415-436.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.

George, P. (1988). *What's the truth about tracking and ability grouping really?* Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida.

Goodland, J., & Oakes, J. (1988). We must offer equal access to knowledge. *Educational Leadership, 45*(5), 16-19.

Hallinan, M.T. (1990). The effects of ability grouping in secondary schools. A response to Slavin's best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(3), 501-504.

Hargreaves, A., Davis, J., Fullan, M., Wignall, R., Stager, M., MacMillan, R. (1992). *Secondary school work cultures and educational change*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (mimeo).

Heibert, E.H. (1987). The content of instruction and student learning: An examination of Slavin's assumptions, *Review of Educational Research, 57*(3), 337-340.

Janyk, M. (1990). *The legal implications of de-streaming*. Toronto: OISE, mimeo.

Jung, P. (1990). Serving the educational and developmental needs of middle level students, *NSSP Bulletin, 74*(525), 73-79.

King, A., & Peart, M. (1990). *The good schools*. Toronto: The Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

Kulik, C., & Kulik, J. (1982). Effects of ability grouping on secondary school students: A meta-analysis of evaluation findings, *American Educational Research Journal, 19*(3), 415-428.

Low, D. (1988). *Ability grouping: Decision-making at the secondary level*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, April.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989). Equity as access to learning: Curricular and instructional treatment differences. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21*(2), 129-149.

Nevi, C. (1987). In defense of tracking, *Educational Leadership, 44*(6), 24-27.

Oakes, J. (1992). Can tracking research inform practice? Technical, normative and political considerations. *Educational Researcher, 21*(4), 12-21.

Radwanski, G. (1987). *Ontario study of the relevance of education and the issue of dropouts.* Toronto: Ministry of Education for Ontario.

Reuman, D. et al. (1983). *Social comparison and ability-grouping effects on ability evaluations in mathematics.* Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Arnheim, California, August.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of school reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scarborough Board of Education (1989). *Streaming: Interpreting the literature.* Scarborough: Scarborough Board of Education.

Skov, P. (1986). *Mixed ability teaching* (journal reference unavailable).

Slavin, R.E. (1987a). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 57*(3), 337-340.

Slavin, R.E. (1987b). Ability grouping in elementary schools: Do we really know nothing until we know everything. *Review of Educational Research, 57*(3), 347-350.

Slavin, R.E. (1988). Synthesis of research on grouping in elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Leadership, 46*(1), 67-77.

Slavin, R.E. (1990a). Achievement effects of ability grouping in secondary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(3), 471-500.

Slavin, R.E. (1990b). Ability grouping in secondary schools: A response to Hallinan. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(3), 505-507.

Sorensen, A.B., & Hallinan, M.T. (1986). Effects of ability grouping on growth in academic achievement, *American Educational Research Journal,* 23(4), 519-542.

Spencer, C., & Allen, M. (1988). *Grouping students by ability: A review of the literature.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302326).

Swartzbough, P. (1988). Eliminating tracking succesfully. *Educational Leadership, 45*, 5, 20-23.

Walberg, H. (1984). Improving the productivity of America's schools. *Educational Leadership, 41*(8), 19-27.

Watson, K. (1985). Mixed-ability classrooms produce superior results. *Highway One,* Fall, 57-63.

Webb, N. (1984). Stability of small group interaction and achievement overtime. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(2), 211-224.

Webb, N., & Cullian, L. (1983). Group interaction and achievement in small groups: Stability over time. *American Educational Research Journal, 20*(3), 411-423.

Wheelock, A. (1992). The case for untracking. *Educational Leadership, 50*(2), 6-10.

4.
School Community Relationships

Kenneth Leithwood and Peter Joong

> It is questionable whether the familiar rituals of visit-school night and parent conferences accomplish more than a polite exchange between parents and teachers. Techniques for parent involvement in home-learning activities have greater potential for actively involving parents in important exchanges with the teacher that may assist their own children's progress in school (Epstein & Becker, 1982, p. 113).

The socio-economic status (SES) of students' families consistently emerges as the most powerful predictor of student success at school (e.g., Coleman et al., 1966; Bridge, Judd, & Moock, 1979). But knowing only this is of very little direct help to schools: it seems to minimize the school's contribution to student growth and render inconsequential efforts at school improvement. Further, SES remains a crude proxy, masking a host of family interactions which have powerful educational consequences. These interactions vary widely across families, often without much relation to family income, for example.

More positively, however, the pervasive contribution of SES to explanations of success at school causes us to be more attentive to the relationship between students' experiences at home and at school. What is there about home environments that in some cases stimulate and in other cases retard childrens' growth? Are some of these characteristics alterable? How might schools interact with families in relation to such alterable characteristics and others so as to improve students' chances of success at school? The bulk of our review in this chapter addresses these questions. Because this chapter is intended to help educators concerned especially with the transition years, school success is defined not only in terms of students' intellectual and social achievement but also in terms of staying in school - not dropping out prior to high school graduation.

This chapter consists of three sections. First, we briefly review those family background characteristics that evidence suggests have important but usually

indirect effects on school success; These characteristics are largely unalterable variables, from the school's perspective. Second, we examine, in more detail, those "foreground" features of the family which directly influence student growth. Walberg (1984) refers to these features as the "alterable curriculum of the home". As a whole, they form what we will refer to as the family's educational culture. Finally, we outline, in yet more detail, those activities undertaken by schools to build partnerships with parents which have demonstrably contributed to school success: a sizeable proportion of the effects of these activities appears to be due to their influence on family educational culture.

The review was not limited to studies of the transition years although the majority of the research included was undertaken with that focus.

Family Background Characteristics

The six family characteristics discussed in this section might be thought of as demographic or status variables. They were identified in an extensive review of research of family influences on cognitive development and student achievement (Scott-Jones, 1984), as well as three reviews of research on factors influencing student drop-out (Rumberger, 1983; 1987; Radwanski, 1987). Of the six background characteristics, five are influenced by the life choices of family members. The sixth, heredity, of course, is not and estimates suggest that 40 to 70% of the variance in an individual's IQ scores can be attributed to genetic inheritance.

Family Configuration. Aspects of family configuration about which there is significant research include family size, birth order and spacing between siblings. In much of this research, these variables are considered to contribute jointly to the intellectual climate of the home for the child. That is (a) family members functioning at a relatively high intellectual level are assumed to provide a better intellectual climate than members functioning at a lower level, and (b) the effects of family members accumulate as the number of members increases. Known as "confluence theory" these assumptions predict intellectual advantages to children lower in the birth order in larger, well-spaced families. However, support for these predictions is quite weak, at present.

Number of parents. On average, children from one-parent/guardian families perform less well than do children from two-parent/guardian families on measures of cognitive development and achievement; they are also at greater risk of dropping out of school before graduation. Explanations for the negative effects of one-parent families include, for example, SES, race, cause of single parent status, child's characteristics, quality and quantity of adult-child interactions and the school's disposition toward the family. "Single-parentness" appears not to disadvantage the child's chances of school success, however, under circumstances of adequate family income, sufficient time for the parent to interact with the child and supportive social relationships surrounding the family (including those provided by the school). Indeed, marital discord may far outweigh the advantages normally attributed a two-parent/guardian family.

Parental employment. Research on parental employment appears to be socially dated because of its almost exclusive focus on the effects of working mothers on their children. Nevertheless, results of this research appear to differ according to the context of maternal employment and the behaviors and attitudes of mothers and children. In general, the effects are reported to be negative for children in "professional class" families, neutral for children in middle class families and positive for children in lower class families. As Scott-Jones notes:

> In low socioeconomic groups, the working mother may be part of an upwardly mobile family that emphasizes educational goals for children more than do similar families in which the mother does not work outside the home (1984, p. 276).

Mother's satisfaction with her work and the adequacy of child supervision during work hours has a bearing on the effects of maternal employment.

Family income. The total financial income of the family contributes both indirectly and directly to school success. Direct effects are noted by Radwanski (1987), for example, who reports 3 to 10% of Ontario dropouts citing financial difficulties as a central reason for school leaving. Radwanski found 4% of dropouts in the U.S. citing this reason. Excessive part-time work (more than about 15 hours per week), sometimes a response to inadequate family income, is also related to dropping out. Less directly, Radwanski cites a $5000 difference in the median annual family income between Ontario drop-outs and non-dropouts.

Education level and occupational status. Family income influences physical living conditions, leisure activity and the like which may contribute to school success. However, family income is confounded, as an explanation, by family education level and occupational status; levels of both are associated with dropping out. Scott-Jones (1984) reviews evidence suggesting that gender directs this effect. That is, mothers' educational level has a greater effect on daughters' intellectual development whereas fathers' educational level has a greater effects as sons'. There is, of course, some reason to believe that these gender effects have begun to diminish in the face of subsequent changes in the gender-based nature of parent-child relationships.

In summary, there is evidence to suggest that the six family background features are related to a child's success at school. With two exceptions these relationships are indirect. That is, such variables as number of parents, parental educational attainment, and the like have potentially powerful effects on the family's educational culture. This culture, in turn, directly affects cognitive development, achievement, and a willingness to continue school. But the strength of the evidence linking each of the family background variables to school success varies considerably. It is quite strong as regards parental educational and occupational attainment and income. The evidence is more ambiguous for other characteristics. In part, this is likely because individual parents sometimes find ways to compensate for the expected negative effects on their children of some aspects of these characteristics and, in part, because effects measured by the research are being confounded by other closely related, uncontrolled variables.

While most of the family background characteristics have indirect effects on school success, we noted the direct effects of inadequate family income on a small proportion of students who feel compelled, as a result, to leave school for the workplace. And, as mentioned earlier, heredity has a direct effect on the student's academic aptitude.

Family Educational Culture

Family background characteristics contribute directly to the creation of an educational culture in the home. We define the content of this culture in terms of

the assumptions, norms, values and beliefs held by the family about intellectual work, in general, school work in particular, and the conditions which foster both. Our review identified eight dimensions of either the family's educational culture or resulting behaviors and conditions demonstrably related to school success. Taken as a whole, these dimensions represent what Walberg (1984) refers to as the "alterable curriculum of the home": this curriculum, according to his analysis, is twice as predictive of academic learning as SES.

Our subsequent description of the eight dimensions is based on the results of six literature reviews (Bloom, 1984; Walberg, 1984; Scott-Jones, 1984; Finn, 1989; Rumberger, 1983; 1987). These reviews were used to develop a brief synopsis of those qualities of the family education culture which contribute most to school success within each of the eight dimensions. Furthermore, in this section we leave unquestioned the traditional mission of the school, its appropriateness for many of its students and the significance of the wider social context of both families and schools. The significance of these issues is addressed subsequently.

Family work habits. Students benefit from a home environment which includes a reasonable degree of routine, emphasis on regularity in the use of space and time and priority given to school work over other activities. It also helps if adults in the family themselves model a positive attitude toward learning.

Academic guidance and support. Student growth is fostered by the quality and availability of parental help and encouragement in relation to school work and by the provision of conditions which support such school work (e.g., study aids). Regular and frequent discussions about school work between parent and child are also useful.

Stimulation. Aside from school work, in particular, students benefit from a home environment which provides opportunities to explore ideas, events and the larger environment. These opportunities may arise, for example, during meal conversations, in response to news events, as part of family travel and the like.

Language development. Student growth is assisted by opportunities in the home for developing correct and effective use of language and by speaking the language of school instruction in the home. Especially among young children, cognitive

development is assisted when adult language is relatively elaborated and when messages are made explicit and context-free.

Academic and occupational aspirations and expectations. School achievement and school completion are strongly related to parents' aspirations and expectations. Such aspirations and expectations have their most positive effect when they are both realistic and high for the individual child. Aspirations also need to manifest themselves in specific standards for school achievement established with the child. Aspirations and expectations can be expressed usefully, but less directly, by parents' demonstrated interest in and knowledge of the child's school work and attendance at school events. Parents should also encourage and monitor regular school attendance and compliance with the school's code of behavior.

Social aspirations and expectations. Early marriage and childbearing were sited as reasons for dropping out by more than a quarter of the students in Rumberger's (1983) American sample of students; Radwanski (1987) reported pregnancy as the main reason given by 14% of an Ontario sample of students. Common-sense family conditions likely to delay marriage and childbearing include, for example, providing children with knowledge of the social and financial consequences of early marriage and childbearing, encouraging association with peers unlikely to take such actions themselves and providing access to birth control devices. Although less direct, high occupational and educational aspirations seem as likely to have the effect of delaying early marriage and childrearing as more direct actions.

Providing adequate health and nutritional conditions. Much of the research concerning relationships between nutrition and health and school success has focused on elementary school students. This research has led to such practical interventions as free breakfast and lunch programs provided by the school, for example. There is every reason to believe that these relationships continue to be important for students in the transition years. Ensuring a balanced diet and adequate sleep are minimum conditions to be fostered by the family - conditions deceptively difficult to provide in the face of a junk food youth culture and the prevalence of part-time work among adolescents.

Physical setting. Some housing conditions affect the cognitive development and achievement of students. In particular, it seems important to provide personal

space for shelter from excessive social stimulation. Excessive noise has also been linked to reading disorders, impaired auditory discrimination and poor performance on visual search tasks.

Family educational culture, in sum, provides psychological conditions which influence directly the students' motivation and opportunity for intellectual development in school and broader life contexts. James Coleman (1966) refers to effects of these psychological conditions as the "social capital" which students bring with them to school. Such capital is an important determinant of students' capacity to gain access to the knowledge potentially available through the school program. Schools intent on providing equality of access to that knowledge will need to find ways of diagnosing their students' social capital and compensating for deficiencies in the social capital some students bring to school.

A Broader Perspective on School-Home Relationships

The previous section left largely unquestioned the traditional mission of the school and its relationship to the family and to the culture of the wider community in which all three are located. Aspects of that culture such as language, values and traditions are of considerable significance for schools. One of our colleagues, in his critique of an earlier version of this chapter, articulated this argument especially clearly:

> There is much in the early analysis, especially the section on 'correct' language that suggests a deficit view of problem families which schools will somehow remedy through their intervention. The help and assistance here seems to be one-way according to a presumed set of cultural values rather than two-way. There is an extensive literature on language and values in different social classes that fundamentally challenges this deficit model which is now rather out of date, and challenges the notion of 'correct' language in favor of different language styles. The same could be said for culture and values. The image that comes through this section is of the school as a benign but paternalistic middle class institution, whose goodness is in question, which can help unfortunate parents currently unable to prosper from the benefits it has to offer. Surely, a central question that needs to be asked here is not just what is it that is wrong with parents that makes it hard for them to be involved with school, but what is it about school (probably its curriculum and what it counts as being 'educated') that

> makes it hard for parents to get involved ... The same point applies to Coleman's concept of "social capital". It presumes the necessity to develop social capital among parents to benefit from what schools currently have to offer, instead of also questioning the cultural assumptions of what now passes for a worthwhile curriculum in schools - and its irrelevance to the lives and needs of many children and their parents. (A. Hargreaves, personal communication)

Many of the concerns raised by Hargreaves are given additional meaning in Louis' (1990) analysis of community values; in particular, the consequences of value fragmentation in the community. When communities have relatively cohesive values (values also shared by the school) the school, the family and the wider community are more likely to be able to offer the child social capital relevant to the educational mission of the school, as well as school-based educational experiences for which there are high levels of consensus and support. In contrast, where there is value fragmentation, the likelihood increases that school will come to be viewed, especially by school professionals, as "making up for" experiences and skills not provided by families or communities.

The issues raised by this critique are complex and in several respects quite controversial. It may be useful, therefore, to clarify further what we are *not* claiming, as well as what we are claiming in respect to schools and the educational culture of the home.

We *are not* claiming, for example: that the traditional nuclear family was or is always supportive of childrens' development; that families alone have the responsibility for providing children with social capital; that family forms should not change; that non-traditional family forms cannot provide children with productive educational cultures and considerable social capital; that parents or guardians in non-traditional family forms should feel guilty about their responsibilities as parents; that other issues such as class, wealth and gender do not play a part in the family's form and its contribution to childrens' educational development. Nor are we claiming that experiences provided to many students through their schools' curricula could not be substantially improved in terms of their contribution to those students' life goals and in recognition of the cultural context for students' learning.

We *are* claiming, on the other hand: that there are many valued types of learning that can best take place within a productive family educational culture; that social capital remains a crucial prerequisite for many valued types of formal learning likely to be addressed in schools; that, just as learning seems to occur best through one-on-one tutoring, social capital is likely produced best through a sustained, personal, supportive and educative relationship between the child and one or more adults; that schools face serious obstacles when they attempt to expand their functions to the provision of social capital and that some of these obstacles are at least partly outside their control (e.g., funding, public images of what a school ought to be, pressure groups with neoconservative agendas largely insensitive to and unsympathetic with the need for schools to provide social capital). Nevertheless, there seems little alternative for schools continuing to address these obstacles. This leads us to the problem of how school-home partnerships can be strengthened.

Strengthening School-Home Partnerships

The purposes for strengthening school-home partnerships are fourfold:

- to assist the school in better understanding the norms, values and traditions of students' families and their consequences for the experiences schools provide to students;

- to assist the family in developing as productive an educational culture in the home as possible;

- through such culture, to add to the social capital which students bring with them to school; and

- to enhance the instructional capacity of the school through a better understanding of the family and through the direct use of family resources in the school program.

The identification of strategies schools can use to strengthen such partnerships is the most practical payoff for school people reading this review. As a consequence, this section of the review relied on a more extensive examination of original studies

than did previous sections. An Eric electronic search was conducted for the period 1980 to 1991 using the headings: middle schools, junior high schools, school-community relationships and parent participation. Along with a manual scan of promising journals, the search produced 20 original studies. These studies used survey (13), case study (6), or a combination of these two (1) research designs. This lack of variety in research design and the relatively small number of studies available for review argue for caution in making use of the results. As a set, the studies may contain systematic bias of an unknown nature, unknown causal relationships and other threats to their validity. (This is the usual admonition to users of most bodies of research - don't bother to look for unambiguous advice or you will be frustrated. On the other hand, if the research seems to support practices which make good sense to you anyway, relish the certainty.)

Nine literature reviews also informed this section. Two of the four most extensive reviews were concerned primarily with the characteristics of effective schools (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Leithwood and Batcher, 1987) or effective instruction (Bloom, 1984). School-community relations were the primary focus of the remaining reviews; Walberg's (1984) and Dembo et al.'s (1985) were quite extensive, whereas the remainder were relatively brief and selective in their choice of research, but useful nonetheless (Solomon, 1991; Nardine & Morris, 1991; Warner, 1991; Davies, 1991).

Joyce Epstein's five types of parent involvement, supplemented with two additional categories, formed the framework for organizing the results of our review. A version of this framework has also been used as the basis for California's policy on parent involvement (Solomon, 1991). The remainder of this section identifies these seven different types of school-home partnerships, estimates the confidence one can have in their value and exemplifies actions associated with each type of involvement.

1. Help parents to develop parenting skills and to foster conditions at home that support learning. A number of quite different programs for helping parents develop a productive educational climate in the home have been examined. These include, for example: parental instruction about how to teach children classroom learning skills; programs which encourage parents to provide specific types of reinforcement for their children for work done at school; and counselling parents about more

effective discipline procedures at home. Walberg's (1984) review of 29 controlled studies about such programs indicated that, in terms of student achievement, over 90% of the studies favored children whose parents were involved in such programs. Dembo et al.'s (1985) review of 48 studies was less optimistic. Certain changes in parental attitude and/or behavior were evident as a result of participation in the different parent education approaches examined. But the authors concluded that:

> ... there are not enough well-designed studies to draw definitive conclusions and implications about the general effectiveness of parent education or whether one type of program is more beneficial for a certain type of family or person (Dembo et al., 1985, p. 183).

Nevertheless, these results suggest, in our view, that parent education programs are worth serious consideration especially by schools hosting students from families with relatively weak educational cultures.

Developing a useful parent education program is a serious curriculum development undertaking, however. Evidence recommends that such development not be undertaken without the commitment of significant time and resources. During such development especially careful attention should be given to the goals and values of parents, characteristics of the child and the practices and mores of the culture and subculture of family members. Such attention seems most likely when there is authentic, comprehensive participation by parent representatives in curriculum development deliberations and in planning for implementation.

2. ***Provide parents with knowledge of techniques designed to assist children in learning at home.*** Evidence concerning this strategy for developing school-parent partnerships was provided by one original study (Redford, 1988) and two literature reviews (Walberg, 1984; Barth, 1979). While learning at home may take several forms, most research has concentrated on the effects of homework and the conditions for maximizing the positive effects of homework (Redford, 1988; Walberg, 1984). Results suggest that the best possible conditions for promoting student learning include teachers assigning homework regularly, perhaps as much as eight to ten hours a week. This time displaces some of the time many children devote to watching television, an activity reported to consume 25 to 30 hours a week

among the majority of students (about 10 hours a week seems to be optimum). Parents provide skillful assistance to students in completing their homework and may even report to school those assignments that seemed to be unproductive: teachers then mark the homework. Such assistance and reporting depend on unusually extensive school-parent collaboration - a form of collaboration in which the school provides regular opportunities for parents to learn about the school's program goals and orientations to instruction.

The significant expenditure of parent time required for these forms of collaboration around homework depends on parents being convinced that their role in helping their child with homework will have significant payoff. This suggests that schools ought to explicitly provide (in a suitable form) parents with the impressive empirical evidence regarding the effects of parent-assisted homework on school success. It is probably unrealistic to expect even those parents completely convinced of the value of their contribution through their child's homework to spend large amounts of time assisting with such homework (Epstein & Becker, 1982). Schools need to be clear about how the parent can help and acknowledge the many other demands on parents' time at home. Not all learning tasks benefit from parent assistance and some parents may do more harm than good; adolescent - parent relationships, in particular, often mitigate against the parents participation in homework. As students move to school schedules involving rotation to multiple teachers, it is important for the school to develop a mechanism for coordinating the assignment of homework. Few things are more frustrating for conscientious parents and students than long absences of assigned homework followed by periods during which most of the student's teachers assign homework at the same time.

Less impressive but still significant effects on achievement do not depend, however, on the ideal conditions for homework described above. The simple act of assigning homework apparently has about the same effect as favourable socioeconomic status; that is, achievement about a quarter of a standard deviation above the norm. On the other hand, the most favorable homework conditions, as described above, appear to triple this effect (achievement about three quarters of a standard deviation above the norm).

An additional focus of research about how schools and parents may collaborate to assist children in learning at home has been programs of home-based

reinforcement of school behavior. These programs are aimed primarily at modifying problematic classroom behavior. Many are based on theories of contingent reinforcement, which run counter to mainstream contemporary views about appropriate classroom management techniques. Nevertheless, Barth's (1979) review of 24 studies of the nature and effects of these programs in both elementary and secondary schools reports impressive results, especially for students with special learning needs. In general, these programs require teachers to provide frequent (often daily) feedback to parents about their child's classroom behavior; parents are then required to provide usually positive reinforcement in the home in response to reports of improvements in classroom behavior by teachers.

Key to the success of these programs is the immediacy of feedback to students about their behavior, in contrast with relying only on infrequent feedback from report cards, for example. Some of these programs appear to provide the kind of "corrective feedback" to students which reviews by both Bloom (1984) and Walberg (1984) estimate to have major positive effects on student achievement.

*3. **Provide access to and coordinate community and support services for children and families.*** Our review uncovered little empirical evidence directly related to this type of school-parent partnership. A number of inferences about the school's role in such a partnership were evident, however. A "typical" adolescent at risk of school failure or dropping out is a member of a racial, ethnic and/or language minority from a lower socioeconomic status family (Rumberger, 1987). Circumstances for these students conspire to bring them face-to-face with more than their share of problems. Their families will experience a disproportionate amount of unemployment, loss of a parent, maternal employment in unrewarding occupations, language spoken at home not the language of instruction at school, educationally debilitating housing conditions and the like.

The "safety net" of social assistance programs provided by the provincial and federal governments is intended to make life more bearable for people who experience these conditions. But often these programs are administered by separate government agencies with little coordination at the level of their consumers. Because schools are likely to be the major institution outside the family to which the student is affiliated, often schools must shoulder the leadership for coordination of community and social services if such coordination is to occur. Although schools

are sometimes frustrated by this expansion of their mandate, the negative effects on the school's educational mandate of students from homes experiencing health, psychological, economic and other forms of difficulty are undeniable. Like it or not, schools do educate the "whole child". To do this for students who bring almost no social capital to the school requires schools to actively initiate the cooperation of all other relevant social service agencies in support of individual, at risk students. The concept of schools of the future being an integrated part of a one-stop social service agency has considerable attraction in this context.

4. Promote clear, two-way communication between the school and the family regarding school programs and students' progress. Evidence regarding this initiative by schools was provided by one literature review (Bloom, 1984) and eight original studies (Redford, 1988; Thompson, 1981; Valentine & Kirkham, 1985; Leithwood, Lawton & Cousins, 1987; Joong, 1991; Wilson & Rossman, 1986; Epstein & Becker, 1982; New York Alliance for Public Schools, 1986). Effective communication, according to this evidence, is a function of its quality, purpose and frequency. Such communication should demonstrate signs of openness and mutual respect. It should be designed to foster parental support for the school's mission and assist parents to feel that they have an important role in accomplishing that mission. School-parent communication should be frequent, coming from a number of sources (the student, teacher, school administrator) and be provided in a variety of forms (newsletters, mailings, face-to-face meetings and conferences).

Effective schools research often reports principals playing key roles in such communication. Sometimes this involves being top-notch sales persons for their school, portraying the school in an attractive light (New York Alliance of Schools, 1986). Studies by Leithwood, Lawton & Cousins (1987) and by Joong (1991) reported that the major effect of principals on their school retention rates was indirect, through the establishment of effective school-community relations.

Many teachers believe that effective communications with parents is vital to their own instructional success and they have devised a number of ways to initiate such communication: these include positive and frequent telephone messages, home visits and requesting parent signatures on assignments and folders. But the extra time required for some of these teacher-based initiatives can be staggering (Epstein & Becker, 1982). And many principals actively discourage greater

involvement with parents! This suggests the need for developing an explicit school policy regarding school-parent communication to support individual teacher initiative. Such a policy would identify acceptable forms and frequencies of communication, identify the time for undertaking such communication, ensure the inclusion of this activity in the school's reward mechanisms and protect exceptionally conscientious teachers from the temptation of overburdening themselves. A school policy would also clarify for parents what form and frequency of communication they should expect from the different teachers of their children from year to year.

5. Involve parents, after appropriate training, in instructional and support roles at school. The significant contribution which parents can make to school success as volunteers in the school and classroom is well known. Indeed, one of the landmark studies of the effects of such volunteers on the development of complex problem solving skills among students was Hedges (1972) study in Ontario. Such positive effects, however, require careful coordination of parent resources in the school, their assignment to meaningful (rather than menial) tasks and substantial training of both teachers and parent volunteers.

6. Support parents as decision-makers and develop their leadership in governance, advisory and advocacy roles. This strategy may be among the most practical ways for schools to become more knowledgeable about the families and communities which they serve and to determine how best to adapt the school environment to better meet the needs of those families and communities. Five studies offered direct testimony to the value of parents playing an integral role in school governance and assuming advocacy roles for the school with the rest of the community (Wilson & Rossman, 1986; Lipsitz, 1984; Morrison, 1978; Valentine & Kirkham, 1985). This is one of five ways the large number of exemplary secondary schools in Wilson & Rossman's study, for example, established collaborative links with the community. These schools:

> ...[made] use of aggressive public relations campaigns that rely on parents as promoters, communicators and decision-makers. Strong parent organizations are the norm in these exemplary schools, and the schools take advantage of that extra good will. Volunteers in these organizations write and disseminate elaborate newsletters that inform the community of school activities (1986, p. 709).

Herman and Yeh (1983) examined the relationship between a number of components of parent involvement and success in a large sample of elementary schools. Parents perception of their influence on school decision-making was significantly related to their satisfaction with the school. Furthermore, school-home communication depended on (was mediated by) parents' feelings of participation in the school for its positive effects on student achievement.

While we did not review systematically the literature on school-based management, this popular initiative for restructuring schools typically enhances parents decision-making roles and responsibilities in school. It, too, can be seen as a strategy for creating more collaborative school-parent relationships. Some forms of school-based management, significantly redistribute power from professionals to parents (Chicago providing the most extreme example of this). Little empirical evidence is yet available about the effects of implementing school-based management, however. What evidence there is argues for caution in moving too far in that direction. As with parents helping their children with homework, there is a need to be realistic about the time demands on parents and those areas of decision-making that can be improved through parent participation. Some forms of serious participation do seem a necessary prerequisite for parental support of school programs.

7. Use community resources and opportunities to strengthen the school program. This strategy directs the school's attention to the school community beyond parents and seeks to make use of the resources to be found there to help in achieving its own goals. As five of the studies in our review suggested this strategy may be useful in several forms:

- Involving students in local community services (Maeroff, 1990; Wilson & Rossman, 1986);

- Attracting financial resources from the community to sponsor particular school projects (Wilson & Rossman, 1986);

- Encouraging community and business leaders as well as civic organizations to sponsor school clubs (George & Oldaker, 1985/86);

- Engage in frequent public events, some of which may be fund-raisers for the school (Fruchter, 1986; George & Oldaker, 1985/86);

- Gaining the cooperation of local merchants to provide safe havens for home-bound students (Fruchter, 1986).

Conclusion

Developing close working relationships with parents is a promising focus for better meeting the needs of students in the transition years. For many students, this period in their lives is the most challenging and confusing they will experience. Pressure from peers to be part of a unique teenage culture conflict with explicit demands to prepare for the many dimensions of mature adult life. Social and intellectual interests cannot be assigned to separate compartments and different people. In such a context, consistency and trustworthiness in the support adolescents receive from adults in their lives is crucial. Bridging the divide between school and family with a strongly collaborative set of working relationships is an important strategy for assisting adolescents to productively cope with this period in their lives.

References

Barth, R. (1979). Home-based reinforcement of school behavior: A review and analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(3), 436-458.

Beckman, V.G.(1981). A study to determine the current level of implementation of eighteen basic middle school principles in the State of Missouri, In R.M. Malinda (Ed.). *Middle school research selected studies, 1977-79, Volume 2.* Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 273).

Bloom, B.S. (1984). The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. *Educational leadership,* May, 4-17.

Bohlinger, T. (1981). The current states of Ohio middle schools implementation of 18 middle school characteristics, In R.M. Malinka (Ed.), *Middle school research selected studies, 1977-79, Volume 2.* Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 273).

Bridge, R., Judd, C., & Moock, P. (1979). *The determinants of educational outcomes.* Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

Coleman, J.E., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, National Centre for Educational Statistics.

Corno, L., Mitman, A., & Hedges, L. (1981). The influence of direct instruction on student self-appraisals: A hierarchical analysis of treatment and aptitude-treatment interaction effects. *American Educational Research Journal, 18*(1), 39-61.

Davies, D.C. (1991). Schools reaching out: Family, school and community partnerships for student success. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(5), 376-382.

Dembo, M.H., Sweitzer, M., & Lauritzen, P. (1985). An evaluation of Group Parent Education: Behavioral PET, and Adlerian Programs. *Review of Educational Research, 55*(2), 155-200.

Duckett, W.R., et al. (1980). Why do some urban schools succeed? *The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools.* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Epstein, J.L., & Becker, H.J. (1982). Teachers reported practices of parent involvement: Problems and possibilities. *The Elementary School Journal, 83*(2), 103-113.

Finn, J.D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research, 59*(2), 117-143.

Ford Foundation (1984). *City high schools: A recognition of progress.* New York: Author.

Fruchter, N. (1986) *Meeting adolescent need: Four effective middle schools.* New York: Advocates for Children of New York Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 312 457).

Gauthier, W.J. (1982). *Connecticut perspectives on instructionally effective schools: A model and process.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April.

George, P.S., & Oldaker, L.L. (1985/86). A national survey of middle school effectiveness. *Educational Leadership,* 43(4), 79-85.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education,* May, 328-355.

Hedges, H.G. (1972). *Volunteer parental assistance in elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Herman, J.L., & Yeh, J.P. (1983). Some effects of parent involvement in schools. *The Urban Review, 15*(1), 11-17.

Huddle, E. (1986). Creating a successful secondary school. *NASSP Bulletin, 70*(491), 64-69.

Joong, P.A. (1990). *An investigation into the relationship between principals' practices, selected school characteristics and student retention.* Toronto: OISE, Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Leithwood, K., & Batcher, E. (1987). *A review of research concerning characteristics of exemplary secondary schools.* Unpublished manuscript, OISE.

Leithwood, K., Lawton, S., & Cousins, B. (1990). The relationship between selected characteristics of effective secondary schools and student retention. In B. Creemers, T. Peters, & D. Reynolds (Eds.). *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Levine, D.U., & Stark, J. (1981). *Instructional and organizational arrangements and processes for improving academic achievement in inner city elementary schools.* Unpublished manuscript. University of Missouri.

Lindle, J.C. (1989). What do parents want from principals and teachers? *Educational Leadership, 47*(2), 12-14.

Lipsitz, J. (1984). *Successful schools for young adolescents.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Louis, K.S. (1990). Social and community values and the quality of teachers' worklife. In M. McLaughlin, J. Tolbert & N. Bascia (Eds.). *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities.* New York: Teachers College Press, 17-39.

Maeroff, G.L.(1990)."Getting to know a good middle school: Shoreham-Wading River". *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(7), 504-11.

Maurer, R.E. (1982). Dropout prevention: An intervention model for today's high schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63*(7), 470-471.

Morrison, P. (1978). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 816.)

Nardine, F., & Morris, R. (1991). Parent involvement in the states: How firm is the commitment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(5), 363-366.

New York Alliance for the Public Schools. (1986). *Programs and policies that work: Helping schools in the middle.* A study of junior high schools in New York City. New York: Author (ERIC Document Reproduction No. Ed 280 916).

Profile of the middle school principal. (1983). *Principal, 62*(4), 30-33.

Radwanski, G. (1987). *Ontario study of the relevance of education, and the issue of dropouts.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Redford, B. (1988) *School effectiveness characteristics and student achievement: A study of relationships in Georgia Middle Schools.* Research/Technical Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 898).

Riegle, J.D. (1971). *A study of middle school programs to determine current level of implementation of eighteen basic middle school principles.* Doctoral Dissertation, E. Lansing, Michigan (Michigan State University).

Rumberger, R.W. (1983). Dropping out of high school: The influence of race, sex and family background. *American Educational Research Journal, 20,* 199-220.

Rumberger, R.W. (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 57*(2), 101-121.

Scott-Jones, P. (1984). Family influences on cognitive development and school achievement. In E. Gordon (Ed.). *Review of Research In Education, 11.* Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Solomon, Z.P. (1991). California's policy on parent involvement: State leadership for local initiatives. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(5), 359-362.

Thompson, A. (1981). "A social climate perspective on home/school relationships in the early secondary school years". In O.Erb (Ed.). *Middle school research studies, 1981*. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association.

Valentine, J.W., & Kirkham, M.M. (1985) A national study of schools in the middle. *Middle School Journal, 16*(4), 12-17.

Walberg, H.J. (1984). Improving the productivity of America's schools. *Educational Leadership, 41*(8), 19-27.

Warner, I. (1991). Parents in touch: District leadership for parent involvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(5), 372-375.

Wilson, B.L., & Rossman, G.B. (1986). Collaborative links with the community: Lessons from exemplary secondary schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(10), 708-711.

Witte, J.F.(undated). *Home-based reinforcement: Behavioral covariation between academic performance and inappropriate behavior.* Denver: Colorado State University.

Witte, J.F., & Walsh, D.J. (1990). A systematic test of the effective schools model. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(2), 188-212.

5.
Core Curriculum

Andy Hargreaves

Background and Need for a Core Curriculum

Current initiatives to restructure secondary education and in the present case, the Transition Years in Ontario, have their immediate roots in the OSIS reform. OSIS was developed and implemented following concerns that students were not being properly prepared for either the world of work or for post-secondary studies. Universities, colleges, and employers perceived that basic literacy, basic skills, and "proper attitudes" had not been acquired by students leaving secondary school. Although those within the secondary education system perceived that students were being adequately prepared to meet the demands and requirements for further academic studies at university or college level, it was felt that the needs of students at basic and general level were not being met. Although the credit system was benefiting advanced-level students, it was not preparing basic and general-level students for either employment or community college.

While OSIS was intended to offer differentiated programs for individuals, in an evaluation of its implementation, Leithwood et al. (1987) discovered deficiencies at the Grade 9 level. Few schools developed basic-level courses at the Grade 9 level and, therefore, did not provide courses at various levels of difficulty. Moreover, schools varied in the number of compulsory courses they required their students to take.

Advanced, general, and basic programs are intended to meet a range of educational needs. In practice, however, the content and focus of the academic program tends to prevail and students in other programs, especially the general level, get watered-down versions of it (King et al. 1988).

John Gray and his colleagues (1988), in their large-scale study of secondary education in Scotland, explain that this watering down of the academic curriculum has, in many respects, occurred for the best of reasons -- allowing as many students as possible to have access to high-level qualifications. The entry of more and more students into such programs is spurred by the pursuit of equality of educational opportunity. It is also fuelled by what Dore (1976) calls "credentialism". Credentialism occurs when high numbers of students become qualified for an occupation at a particular level. The requirements for the occupation are raised and become inflated. The pursuit of qualifications becomes ever more frantic, increasing the emphasis on educational qualifications in a ratchetlike process. Such a process may explain the expansion of the Ontario Secondary School Diploma (OSSD) requirement of 30 credits for all students in 1984. This credentialism cannot continue indefinitely. There comes a point when the difficulty of achieving qualifications becomes too great, when course requirements become overwhelming. This, as the Select Committee (Government of Ontario 1988) learned from many of the groups presenting evidence to it, is when dropout rates are likely to increase.

Beneath the dominance of academic curricula are much deeper processes which are, in many respects, responsible for subject specialization in secondary schools, departmentalized structures, and their resistance to change. Secondary schools have a very strong academic orientation. Wake et al. (1979), in their comprehensive summary of changes in European education, point out that there is growing awareness that both the existing context of secondary education and the arrangement of it are either outdated or no longer important in contemporary life. They also note, however, that changes do not come easily.

McPartland et al. (1987) refer to a "subject-matter orientation" in high schools through which teachers perceive themselves as experts in particular subjects. They note that teaching practices tend to follow a continuum, from "pupil orientation" at the elementary level to "subject orientation" at the secondary level. Corbett et al. (1987) argue that subject specialization is considered very much a "sacred norm" at the secondary level. As Emile Durkheim (1956) suggested more than 50 years ago, tampering with such norms can create a sense of panic among teachers, as they hold the "sacred" to be unquestionably true.

A number of factors contribute to the strength and persistence in secondary schools of this emphasis on academic specialization and departmentalization:

Teacher recruitment: Teachers training for secondary education are more subject-oriented than their colleagues training for elementary education (Book and Freeman, 1986; Lacey, 1977).

Teacher identity: Throughout their education in secondary school, in university and beyond, teachers become attached to their subjects, developing loyalty toward them. Subjects become a major part of their identity (Bernstein, 1971). To challenge their subject and its integrity is to challenge that identity.

Subject histories: There is a fairly extensive literature on the histories of school subjects (e.g., Tomkins, 1986; Goodson, 1988; Goodson and Ball, 1985). It reveals that school subjects create not just intellectual communities but social and political communities as well (Hargreaves, 1989). School-subject boundaries have been, in many ways, arbitrarily defined. What counts as a subject and as valid content for that subject shifts over time, as different communities and traditions fight for influence within the subject (Ball, 1983). This process has been thoroughly documented even for subjects like mathematics (Cooper, 1985). We can also see the same kind of processes taking place in the current struggle between the "literature" and "communication" branches of English curriculum, for example. With respect to the establishment and defence of subject boundaries, Goodson (1983) describes the irony of geography, which was initially resisted by teachers of other subjects on the grounds that it was "not a real subject". Geography, in turn, then resisted the later establishment of other subjects like environmental studies, on the grounds that they were "not real subjects".

In practice, most of the current secondary school subjects are a legacy of the early twentieth century -- a time when working class students were beginning to take advantage of secondary education opportunities. The United States Committee of Ten's deliberations of 1893 and the English Secondary Education Regulations of 1904 were the key curriculum landmarks of the time (Goodson, 1988; Hargreaves, 1989; Tomkins, 1986). In many ways, their definition of the secondary curriculum as academic was a way of limiting working-class aspirations. Subjects which were devised, developed, and established largely to serve the interests of the middle and

upper classes came to be seen as the valid definition of secondary curriculum for all. In this sense, today's "natural" curriculum is, in many respects, an arbitrary one, historically defined, that meets the needs of some students but not all (Wake et al. 1979).

Department politics: In secondary schools, subjects are normally taught in departments. These departments have territories to defend and resources to protect. They compete with each other for rooms and cupboards, favourable timetable slots, compulsory curriculum status, and student numbers (Goodson and Ball, 1985). They also provide career routes for their members. Subject departments are highly politicized entities. This is one of the reasons why curriculum integration and staff collaboration across departments is so hard to achieve in secondary schools. Not only are identities threatened but interests too.

Student entry into post-secondary institutions: Subject-based qualifications can be "cashed-in" by students for career and further educational opportunities. They are a kind of "cultural capital" (Hargreaves, 1989). Universities are powerful gatekeepers of the academic curriculum in secondary schools. To challenge the academic curriculum, therefore, is seen as a threat by universities as well as by (usually more advantaged) parents who wish their children to go to these universities.

Subject status: The school curriculum is divided into what might be called "high-status" and "low-status" knowledge areas (Young 1971). "High-status" knowledge is academic, theoretical, and relatively easily assessed. It is treated as important within the curriculum and usually has compulsory status, large time allocations, high timetabling priority, and attracts many students. "Low-status" knowledge is non-academic, practical, and much more difficult to assess. It has low importance in the curriculum, lower time allocations, lesser timetabling priority, and attracts fewer students. The difference between high-status and low-status knowledge is chiefly a difference between rigour and relevance.

Teachers, schools, and subject associations are well acquainted with the implicit rules underpinning these differences of subject status. They try to raise the status of their favoured subjects by making them more theoretical, expanding more effort assessing them and so forth. Many developments in physical education and family

studies can be explained in these terms. The cost of improving a subject's status, though, may be the loss of that very relevance which was the source of its attraction for less academically oriented students. In this way, we can see that the dominance of academic values in schools affects developments not just <u>across</u> subjects, but <u>within</u> them too.

Two consequences of this subject emphasis and academic orientation are worth mentioning:

Overcrowded curriculum: Because of the strength of the academic curriculum, and of subject interests within it, whenever schools are required to take on new mandates such as AIDS or drug education, the curriculum is treated like an old, familiar bookcase. New books are continually added but none is take away (Gray et al. 1983). Additions are made to the existing structure but the structure is not altered to accommodate the changes. The result is overcrowding, clutter, and lack of coherence (Wideen and Pye, 1989; Radwanski, 1987). Assigning responsibility for AIDS Education to physical education teachers (because theirs is a compulsory subject) rather than to family studies teachers (whose subject is usually optional) can be explained in these terms.

Content-laden curriculum: Secondary school curriculum is designed to "cover" the required subjects and to be sure that the information is provided to students. Consequently, teachers must teach to the intellectual middle of the class (Carroll, 1990). The subject-based curriculum tends to create classes which are more content-focused than process-focused, geared to teaching subjects not students. Curriculum documents themselves reflect this emphasis. Pratt (1987) found this to be very much the case in a content analysis of 100 school board curricular guidelines from across Canada, and we have already mentioned the content orientation among science teachers as reported in a survey by the Peel Board of Education (Beaton, J., Both, S., Fine, J., and Hember, D. 1988). There is evidence that strong content orientation may have adverse effects on the quality of instruction. In a study of teachers' sense of efficacy and its relationship to student achievement, Ashton and Webb (1986) found that there was a strong and significant relationship between teachers' low sense of efficacy (their felt capacity to improve student achievement, irrespective of students' backgrounds), their preoccupation with covering content, and their reliance on safe, undemanding instructional methods.

Academic subjects and the academic orientation of secondary schools are therefore heavily institutionalized both historically and politically. Buttressed by the universities and seen by many parents and communities as "real learning" or "real school" (Metz, 1988), they have a pervasive effect on the character of secondary schools as a whole and on their capacity to deliver effective and appropriate services to all their students. There is nothing inherently wrong with academic subjects, and much that is praiseworthy about them, but the extent of their influence on the curriculum appears to have had a number of far-reaching consequences:

- lack of balance, lack of breadth, and lack of coherence in the overall curriculum;
- tendency to focus on content more than on instruction, adversely affecting the quality and diversity of instruction;
- creation of a curriculum with low relevance which can be unduly difficult and dispiriting for many students;
- fragmentation of student experience, preventing sustained engagement with curriculum, teachers, and even peers;
- balkanization of secondary schools and departments, making it difficult for the school to respond as a whole to outside influences and changes, and to establish cross-curricular themes and objectives.

Clearly, curriculum in Ontario is rooted in an academic tradition. Legislation in the last several decades has attempted to loosen the stranglehold that an overcommitment to an academic orientation has had on secondary schooling. Many of the submissions to the Select Committee (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1988b) argued for a shift in emphasis -- a shift to make schools more attractive and more responsive to students who may not be served best by an academic, subject-based curriculum. One possible vehicle for creating such a shift is to adopt a core curriculum, as outlined for Grades 7, 8, and 9 in the Throne Speech of 1989. Such a curriculum has also been foreshadowed in Transition Years: Grades 7, 8 and 9, Policies and Requirements 1992 (Ontario Ministry of Education).

Definition of Core Curriculum

The term "core curriculum" suggests that, whatever learning experiences pupils undertake, there are certain essential activities at the heart of their programme of studies. The core curriculum will constitute those activities or studies that all pupils will be expected to undertake. The term also implies that the core will constitute only part of pupils' total programme ... (Kirk, 1986b, 22).

Criteria for Justifying a Core Curriculum

There is no single justification for a core curriculum. Many arguments have been advanced in its support. Some compete, some are complementary. The particular kinds of core curricula that are developed usually reflect the criteria that are used to justify the creation of the core curriculum. Six key criteria are evident in the literature reviewed for this chapter.

Equality of opportunity: This justification is common in most of the countries of Western Europe (Wake et al. 1979). Premature streaming or premature choice among programs can injure students' later life chances. A common curriculum is seen as a way of leaving options open until as late as possible and thereby helping equalize opportunities among classes, cultures, and sexes (Hargreaves, 1982; ILEA, 1984; Ontario Ministry of Education, 1988b; Adler, 1982; Sewall, 1983; Boyer, 1983).

Educational quality: One commonly stated aim of school systems is bringing all students up to a basic level of competence by a particular grade (for instance, Grade 10) so that they can function fully as citizens in society (Radwanski, 1987; Sullivan, 1988; Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1989). High expectations are usually attached to these minimum standards. In core curricula where this aim is paramount, there tends to be an emphasis on basic skills and academic subjects.

Transmission and development of the culture: Core curriculum is seen as a vehicle for the transmission and development of common social values, knowledge, and other learning considered important in a multicultural society. Although minority cultures are recognized, the need to integrate this knowledge into a unified social vision through a common curriculum is seen as important if people are to live together harmoniously and productively (Barrow, 1979; Lawton,

1975; Williams, 1961). David Hargreaves (1982) relates core curriculum to the development and restoration of community and proposes that community studies form a key part of it. Griffiths (1980) insists that the rejuvenation of national cohesion will be achieved through a common curriculum taught to all students. Many writers (e.g., Barrow, 1979) see criticism of the culture and the development of democratic values as central to core curriculum. These rationales for a core curriculum produce curriculum guidelines in which the liberal arts are strongly represented.

Educational entitlement: A core curriculum promises access to fundamental forms of knowledge that can enable students not only to reach a minimum level of competence, but also to develop fully as "well-rounded" human beings. While this criterion was a powerful component of curriculum reform in Britain in the early 1980s, it was ultimately dropped for safer goals of consistency between schools, basic competency in learning, and focus on academics. Building a core curriculum on the basis of educational entitlement involves recognizing different forms of intelligence (Gardner, 1983), forms of knowledge (Hirst, 1975), or areas of educational experience. In Britain, Her Majesty's Inspectorate (1983) outlined eight areas of educational experience. These were: the aesthetic and the creative, the linguistic, the physical, the social and political, the ethical, the mathematical, the scientific, and the spiritual. All students, the Inspectorate stated, should have access to these essential areas of experience as part of a balanced education. The Australian Curriculum Development Centre, in seeking to establish the basis for a core curriculum, defined it in terms of nine major domains "through which human experience and understanding have been organized and represented" (Skilbeck, 1984). Those were arts and crafts; environmental studies; mathematical skills and reasoning and their applications; social, cultural, and civic studies; health education; scientific and technological ways of learning and their social applications; communication; moral reasoning and action, values, and belief systems; work, leisure, and lifestyle. Such proposals tend to lead to one of two kinds of curricula: those organized around very different categories than at present, perhaps with integrated studies figuring strongly; and those with categories remaining much as they are, with "areas of experience" (defined above) being used to ensure that balance is achieved within and across subject categories.

Stimulating and recognizing achievement: Developing a curriculum that stimulates, recognizes, and rewards a range of educational achievements, not just academic ones, in order to maximize the possibilities for success and build motivation among the student population, is a common justification for a core curriculum. The assumption here is that student achievement is boosted not by giving less academic students more of what they are poor at, but by nurturing success through building self-esteem. By recognizing and rewarding neglected strengths, it is argued, such core curriculum develops the sticking power that students need to work on areas in which they are weak. In its review of problems of underachievement in secondary schools, the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) (1984) identified four aspects of achievement:

- *Intellectual-cognitive achievement* is concerned with propositional knowledge which is easily written down, remembered, and relatively easily assessed. Knowledge tends to be emphasized more than skill, memorization more than problem-solving. This aspect of achievement is strongly represented in the secondary curriculum and, in many respects, dominates it.

- *Practical achievement* is concerned with the practical application of knowledge. It is more oral than written. It is most obviously present in subjects like Industrial Arts but can also be seen in investigative approaches to science. In fact, it can be developed anywhere in the curriculum. Practical achievement is somewhat more difficult to evaluate and thus receives less emphasis in the curriculum than propositional knowledge.

- *Personal and social achievement* is concerned with the skills of cooperation, initiative, leadership, and ability to work in groups. While these are the skills that empowers value, they receive less emphasis in the curriculum and are considerably harder to assess. As we discussed earlier, there are many personal and social skills which students do not get opportunities to show in the classroom. Neither are these skills assessed or recorded. While much of this aspect of achievement generally goes unstimulated and unrecognized in the conventional classroom, it is revealed in other settings such as cooperative education.

- *Motivation* subsumes the others and is perhaps the most interesting. Teachers and schools often assume that motivation is something that students either bring

with them to school or do not. You are lucky if you have motivated students to teach, unlucky if you do not. Motivation is usually assessed under the heading of "Effort". Many schools, say the ILEA Committee, pay little attention to motivation. Some actively depress it. Yet the willingness and commitment to learn, says the Committee, is itself an achievement to be developed, something for which the school holds responsibility. Failure to develop achievement in this area will probably lead to failure in the other three.

As with the criterion of educational entitlement, when the criterion of stimulating and recognizing achievement figures strongly in the justification for a common curriculum, a broad curriculum results, rather than one focused on only one area of learning or aspect of achievement.

Support for instruction, guidance, and welfare: This justification aims to secure coherence among curricular, instructional, and guidance objectives. An example of this approach to core curriculum and its integration with other educational objectives is outlined in the report of a task force of the California League of Middle Schools (Lake 1988b). The report recommended that, within the curriculum, time should be provided to incorporate core courses, exploratory courses, and collaborative and self-contained teaching. According to the task force, a core curriculum would meet the needs of junior high school students in transition.

The "core block" of time within the curriculum would enable educators to smooth transition by providing extended time with one or two teachers. It would also help: to create a home-base for students and increase student advisory programs; to increase students' sense of belonging, self-esteem and to improve attitudes toward school; to foster teacher collegiality through team teaching and an interdisciplinary approach to instruction; to allow time for increased variety in instructional methods and to provide every student with access to the same learning experiences.

Structure of a Core Curriculum

It is important, when devising a core curriculum, to be clear about the principles one is using and to return to those principles to check that the curriculum fulfils them. While pragmatic and organizational considerations have to be taken into

account, it is important that they do not displace the goals which prompted the creation of a particular kind of core curriculum in the first place.

What kinds of core curricula are possible? What principles do they realize? How best do they meet the needs of the Transition Years? According to Skilbeck (1984), there are three distinct ways of interpreting and organizing a core curriculum. It may be:

- a set of required subjects or subject matter embodied within a centrally determined syllabus to be taught to all students;

- a set of required subjects or subject matter determined by a school with courses and activities required for all students;

- a broadly outlined statement of required learning for all students, defined by both central and local bodies and interpreted by schools.

For Skilbeck, the main difference among these ways of organizing a curriculum is the amount of local control in the decision-making processes (also Kelly, 1990; Kirk, 1986). Skilbeck's second definition appears not very workable in a provincial context, particularly in view of guarantees for every school that a core curriculum would meet the goals of educational entitlement and development of the culture. Leaving the organization of core curriculum entirely to individual schools would lead to inconsistency in the achievement of provincial curricular objectives.

Skilbeck's other two definitions are more workable in the Ontario context. In reviewing, evaluating, and developing these definitions, it is important to take into account how well each meets the criteria for a core curriculum we outlined earlier. To recap, these criteria are:

- equality of opportunity;
- educational quality;
- common culture and community;
- educational entitlement;
- achievement and motivation;
- integration.

Core curriculum as a set of required subjects or subject matter contains two sub-definitions. The first is a set of "required subjects". This type of core curriculum was put forward in both Newfoundland and Labrador and in Great Britain.

A task force appointed by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador (1989) concluded that low expectations of students must be reversed and that streamed programs which restrict career opportunities and further education are not acceptable. Many of the recommendations of the task force were based on the following principles:

- Teaching basic academic subjects (including math and science) to all students should be the highest priority of schools.

- High school programs should be constructed to maximize student participation in basic academic courses, in order to give students greater access to post-secondary education.

- High school programs should ensure that most students can achieve success in basic academic courses.

- High participation rates and high levels of performance are interrelated goals. However, high performance expectations should not result in high dropout rates.

- High school programs should prepare students for post-secondary education by encouraging them to choose programs and courses which will give them access to post-secondary institutions.

The British Education Reform Act (1988) outlined a core curriculum organized around existing subject categories which was implemented as the National Curriculum (Kelly, 1990). Made up of a core of mathematics, English, and science, with the additional foundation subjects of modern languages, geography, history, creative arts, physical education, and technology, its academic emphasis is unambiguous. However, its designers claim that it is not wholly knowledge-based and that it also deals with attitudes, skills, and experiences. In addition, they claim

that it encourages cross-curricular work in the development of skills, personal and social development, and the like. And conventional contents like a high emphasis on *British* history and *British* literature also prevail *within* those subjects (Goodson, 1990). Nonetheless, in terms of time allocations, conventional subjects predominate (Hargreaves, 1989). Broadly speaking, these kinds of subject-based curricula are what Radwanski (1987) recommended for Ontario.

Common courses are seen to enhance *equality of opportunity*. The setting of national benchmarks within each subject at ages 7, 11, and 14 is directed towards achieving the goal of *educational quality*. While the development of *culture and community* are achievable goals, they are more difficult to attain within existing fragmented subject categories.

The notion of a subject-based common curriculum runs counter to several other criteria for a core curriculum, though. Its lack of breadth prevents it from meeting the goal of *educational entitlement*. Neither does it cover, in equal measure, the different aspects of *achievement*. The balkanized character of high schools that this subject-centered approach allows to persist and even prosper, also presents a serious threat to the combining of curriculum, guidance, and instruction in programs for Transition years students.

The approach advocated in Newfoundland and Labrador and in Great Britain has further disadvantages. These include a content focus that is already strong within subject communities, a restriction of opportunities for teacher development where there is little curriculum left for teachers to develop, and student demotivation. If students lose motivation in spending even more time on areas in which they are weak, adverse effects on student equality will result.

The second subdefinition of core curriculum is prescribed "subject matter", rather than prescribed subjects. One example of this type of core curriculum is outlined in the British Columbia Royal Commission Report on Education (Sullivan, 1988) and further developed in the policy document *Year 2000: A Curriculum and Assessment Framework for the Future* (Government of British Columbia, 1989).

The Commission recommended that the Ministry of Education develop a "common curriculum" for all students in Grades 1 to 10 and that it include humanities, fine arts, sciences, and practical arts (Sullivan, 1988). Within these subject groups, English, social studies, and French are to promote the development of language skills and an understanding of human relationships. Music, visual arts, theater, dance are to provide alternative modes of thinking and encourage creativity. The sciences (mathematics, general science, and technology) and the practical arts (physical education, industrial arts, lifespan education, and home economics), along with the humanities and fine arts, are to develop academic and life skills while fostering individual creativity and aptitudes. A similar core curriculum has been implemented in secondary schools in Utah. Although subject areas are not yet finalized, the courses include communication, mathematics, science, social studies, arts, technology, vocational education, and lifestyle (Utah State Office of Education, 1985).

The British Columbia Royal Commission stressed that moral education goes on in schools as they impact values, standards of conduct, and moral beliefs upon which our society is based. These underlying principles, it stated, should be stressed in both curricular and extracurricular activities.

In these kinds of common curricula, it is hoped that a common curriculum will *integrate* subject areas, since all subject areas develop students' abilities and skills. The Commission recommended that, throughout the common curriculum, an interdisciplinary teaching approach be used and that, at any given grade level, teachers instruct in at least two different subject areas. This would reduce the practice of teachers being assigned to only one subject area. These aspects of curriculum integration will be examined again later. In addition, to satisfy individual students' interests, needs and rates of development, it was recommended that students have access to cross-grade and/or multigrade classroom groups.

A common curriculum, it was asserted, would create a supportive environment for students. The Royal Commission maintained that students would benefit from a sense of identification with a caring and emphatic teacher in the school. Thus, the Commission recommended that a teacher, adviser, or mentor be available to each student in each year of the common curriculum.

Extracurricular activities were identified as a significant component of the education process, as a supplement to students' regular curricular experiences. This component of education is not, however, equally available to all students. The Commission, therefore, recommended that adequate funding for extracurricular activities be provided to guarantee all students equal access.

To allow flexibility and to provide opportunities for locally developed programs, the Commission recommended that the common curriculum take up no more than 80% of teaching time. Upon completion of the common curriculum for Grades 1 to 10, students would receive an official certificate permitting them entry into an extra two years of secondary education.

Based on the findings of the Commission, the Government of British Columbia (1989) released a report entitled *Year 2000: A Curriculum and Assessment Framework for the Future,* which demonstrated its commitment to implementing the proposed curriculum changes. This report promotes a learner-focused curriculum which provides for continuous progress and self-direction, and, at the same time, takes into consideration variations in individual development (Government of British Columbia, 1989). The Year 2000 report supports the concept of a common curriculum based on the humanities, sciences, practical arts, and fine arts which stresses student learning outcomes and experiences rather than learning activities.

The B.C. proposal for a common curriculum is ambitious. It makes the same promises of *equality of opportunity* and *educational quality* as its subject-based counterparts in Newfoundland and Labrador and Great Britain. Its broad thematic structure makes the goals of *community* and *integration* easier to achieve and it encourages curricular integration. It is a bold strategy promising fundamental change and significant improvement. However, at the Transition Years stage, the proposal has three sources of weakness.

First is the omission, in the Transition Years, of essential areas of educational experience, especially those that deal with the practical arts. This threatens the principle of *educational entitlement*. Second is the principle of *integration*, which is discussed in Chapter 8. Third, is the danger of overspecifying content. If content of

curriculum is closely prescribed, programs may become content-driven and inflexible. The quality of instruction may suffer, as may opportunities for teacher development. If anything, we might do better to begin "unwriting" the details of our curriculum guidelines instead of trying to specify them still more closely!

Core curriculum as a broad outline defined by both central and local bodies and interpreted by schools: This is the other major way of defining a core curriculum. Such a curriculum might possess the following characteristics:

- It would be defined not in terms of subject knowledge, courses of study, or detailed content, but in terms of broad areas of experience and human understanding of the sort we described earlier (Her Majesty's Inspectorate, 1983; Skilbeck, 1984).

- Defining a core curriculum in terms of broad areas of experience would meet most, if not all, of the criteria for establishing such a curriculum. Compared with subject-based models, models organized around areas of experience would address two criteria particularly effective -- students' *entitlement* to a broad and balanced range of educational experiences; and their access to expanded opportunities for educational *achievement*.

- A core curriculum defined in broad terms would leave sufficient scope for, and flexibility in curriculum development and teacher development at the level of the school. School-based curriculum development and teacher development are vital to the success of curriculum and assessment reform (Hargreaves, 1991; Skilbeck, 1984; Rudduck, in press). Teacher development, we have seen, in the form of close working relationships with colleagues, builds collective commitment to norms of continuous improvement which makes teachers responsive to, and interested in change (Little and Bird, 1984). Yet teacher development is inseparable from curriculum development (Stenhouse, 1980). Teachers are unlikely to collaborate unless there is something substantial for them to collaborate on; unless there are significant things within the curriculum of which they can take ownership. A core curriculum leaving considerable latitude in curricular judgments at school level is necessary for these important developments to take place.

• Leaving curriculum development entirely to the discretion of the school can create indefensible omissions and inconsistencies. Yet we have seen that close prescription of content through written curriculum guidelines can create a culture of dependency among teachers, leading to a preoccupation with coverage. How then can teachers and schools be helped to meet broadly defined curriculum guidelines in their own particular way? Hargreaves (1989) suggests that systems of inspection, support, and review, administered at the school board level, could ensure that schools sincerely try to meet board requirements and the core curriculum. Such systems can help teachers, through the process of school-based curriculum development, to address the broad guidelines in their own particular way. School board consultants and superintendents might usefully undertake this role, diverting some of their time and energy from writing those detailed curriculum guidelines which currently appear to restrict many of the opportunities for curriculum development in our schools.

Summary

A core curriculum can take many forms and be developed according to many criteria. From the point of view of helping students adapt more positively and more effectively in the long run to secondary schools, it is important that the curriculum is broad and that it recognizes a wide range of educational achievements. This suggests a curriculum organized not around specific subjects and subject matter, but around broad areas of educational experience. It also suggests a different role for school board consultants in working closely with small groups of schools, to help them meet these broad guidelines, and ensure they are endeavouring to do so sincerely.

A core curriculum of this kind is likely to avert and even counter the demotivating effects of the present subject-based academic curriculum. It is also likely to leave schools and teachers sufficient scope and flexibility to develop the substance of their own curricula: creating a culture of confident teachers who are committed to change and improvement. This kind of broadly defined, yet locally developed, core curriculum offers an important chance of superseding the traditional alternatives of centrally imposed and school-based models of curriculum development -- models which have hitherto enjoyed little success in breaking the stranglehold of academic influence on the secondary school curriculum.

References

Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficiency and student achievement*. New York: Longman.

Ball, S. (1983). A subject of privilege: English and the school curriculum: 1906-35. In Hammersley, M., & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). *Curriculum practice: Some sociological case studies*. New York and Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Barrow, R. (1979). *The Canadian curriculum: A personal view*. London (Ontario): Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario.

Beaton, J., Both, S., Fine, J., & Hember, D. (1988). *The Peel Board of Education Science Review*. Report PGSCIECE/4436. Peel Board of Education.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In Young, M.F.D. (Ed.), *Knowledge and control*. New York: Collier-MacMillan.

Book, C., & Freeman, D.J. (1986). Differences in entry characteristics of elementary and secondary teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(2), 47-51.

Carroll, J. (1990). The Copernican Plan: Restructuring the American High School. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(3).

Cooper, B. (1985). *Renegotiating Secondary School Mathematics*. New York and Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Corbett, H., Dickson, R., Firestone, W., & Rossman, G. (1987). Resistance to planned change and the sacred in school cultures. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 23*(4).

Dore, R. (1976). *The diploma disease*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and sociology*. New York: Free Press.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Goodson, I.F. (1988). *The making of curriculum.* New York: Falmer Press.

Goodson, I.F., & Ball, S. (Eds.) (1985). *Defining the curriculum.* New York and Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Gray, J., McPherson, A.F., & Raffe, D. (1983). *Reconstructions of secondary education.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Griffiths, D.E. Beyond the Basics. (1980). *New York University Education Quarterly, 12*(1), 2-6.

Hargreaves, A. (1989). *Curriculum and assessment reform.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Hargreaves, D. (1982). *The challenge for the comprehensive school: Culture, curriculum and community.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hirst, P. (1975). *Knowledge and the curriculum.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Inner London Education Authority. (1984). *Improving secondary schools.* London: Author.

King, A., Warren, W., Michalski, C., & Peart, M. (1988). *Improving student retention in Ontario secondary schools.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers.* London: Methuen.

Lake, S. (1988). *Scheduling the middle level school: Philosophy into practice.* Sacramento, CA.: California League of Middle Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 300 920).

Lawton, S., Leithwood, K., Batcher, E., Donaldson, E., & Stewart, R. (1988). *Student retention and transition in Ontario high schools.* Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Leithwood, K., Cassie, B., Cousins, B., Hannay, L., Maynes, F., Robinson, F., Quirouette, P., Seller, W., Townsend, R., & Miller, J. (1987). *The nature and consequences of selected processes for developing, implementing and institutionalizing major educational policies.* Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Leithwood, K., Miller, J., Ross, S., Maynes, F., & MacKeracher, D. (1987). *The development of Ontario schools: Intermediate and senior divisions -- 1984 (OSIS) and the Initial Phase of Its Implementation.* Toronto: Queen's Printer of Ontario.

Little, J.W., & Bird, T. (1984). *Report on a pilot study of school-level collegial teaming.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 266 540).

McPartland, J. (1987). *Balancing high quality subject-matter instruction with positive teacher-student relations in the middle grades: Effects of departmentalization, tracking and blocking scheduling on learning environments.* Report No. 15. Centre for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 291 704).

Metz, M. (1988). *The American High School: A Universal Drama Amid Disparate Experience.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Radwanski, G. (1987). *Ontario study of the relevance of education and the issue of dropouts.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Rudduck, J. (in press). *Innovation, involvement and understanding.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Skilbeck, M. (1984). *School-based curriculum development.* London: Harper and Row.

Stenhouse, L. (1980). *Curriculum research and development in action.* London: Heinemann.

Sullivan, B.M. (1988). *A legacy for learners: The report of the Royal Commission on education*. Victoria, British Columbia.

Tomkins, G.S. (1986). *A common countenance: Stability and change in the Canadian Curriculum*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall.

Wake, R., Marbeau, V., & Peterson, A. (1979). *Innovation in secondary education in Europe*. Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Wideen, M., & Pye, I. (1989). *The struggle for change in a complex setting: A literature review for the high school*. Research study of high schools for School District No. 36. Surrey, B.C.: Simon Fraser University.

Williams, R. (1961). *The long revolution*. London: Chatto and Windus.

Young, M.F.D. (1971). (Ed.) *Knowledge and control*. London: Collier-MacMillan.

6.
Curriculum Integration

Andy Hargreaves

There is a wide literature on curriculum integration. Working in the context of the British Columbia Tri-University Integration Project, Clark (1991) has compiled a bibliography of over 300 items on the subject that merits detailed consultation for the particularly interested reader.

Curriculum integration has been reviewed and analyzed at different levels of the educational system: for instance, in the context of elementary education (Pappas, et al., 1990, Williams, 1980), middle schools (Kasten et al., 1990; Quattrone, 1989), secondary education (Watts 1980), and adult education (Dickinson et al., 1980); in special education (Hamre-Nietupuki, et al., 1989; Gire and Poe, 1988; Kersch, et al., 1987) and in multicultural settings (Haase, 1980). It has been reviewed and analyzed in the context of a range of different subjects including language arts (Norton, 1988; Duncan, 1987; Allen and Keller, 1983; Goodman, et al., 1987; Stahl and Miller, 1989), science and mathematics (Shainline, 1987; Friend, 1984; Hunter, 1980); social studies and humanities (Atwood, 1989; Kaltsounis, 1990; Craig, 1987; Heath, 1988; Berg, 1988; Cardinale, 1988; Wolf, 1988; Rudduck, 1991), vocational and career education (Greenan and Tucker, 1990; Stevens and Lichtenstein, 1990; Pickard, 1990; Rutgers, 1981; Gire and Poe, 1988; Adelman, 1989) computers and information technology (Komski, 1990; Brent, et al., 1985); ecology (Jewett and Ennis, 1990), and broader core programs (Hairston, 1983).

Within and across these different domains of inquiry, three different types of review and analysis have been conducted. Most common are descriptive accounts of particular initiatives in curriculum integration, often by the people responsible for the development, and presumably, therefore, also for the success or failure of those initiatives (e.g., Mansfield, 1989; Hunter, 1980). There is usually an element of program evaluation in these accounts, but it tends to be light.

Second, there are conceptual and philosophical analyses of the meaning of curriculum integration, a number of which extend back to the earlier part of this

century, although conceptual analysis remains a key component of the integration literature (Northwestern Educational Service. District 189, 1989; Barnes, 1982; Betts, 1983; Conklin, 1966; Connelly, 1954; Dressel, 1958; Hirst, 1974; Pring, 1973; Richmond, 1975). In some cases, these conceptual analyses extend toward more organizationally driven typologies of the different forms that curriculum integration might hypothetically take (e.g., Case, 1991a).

Finally, and least commonly, there are empirical studies of the interpretation and consequences of curriculum integration in practice (e.g., Weston, 1979, Olson, 1983; Musgrave, 1973). Our concern in this review is with two aspects of curriculum integration in particular: its meaning and realization, and its implementation and practical consequences.

Meaning

One essential condition for successful innovation is that the meaning of the innovation has *clarity* (Fullan, 1991). A common problem with discussions of and prescriptions for integration at the level of education policy is that the meaning of integration is often vague, unclear, ambiguous and sometimes even vacuous. Werner (1991a, 1991b), for instance, has identified widespread vagueness in discussions of integration within policy documents surrounding recent educational reforms in British Columbia. Confusions have abounded, he says, as to whether integration refers to the integration of time, of teachers, of students, or of curriculum. The scope and ambiguity of the definition has permitted many teachers to review their practice and 'discover' examples of integration they are already doing that can be contained within the broad definition of the policy prescription. Integration, in this sense, supplies a new rhetoric for justifying existing practice rather than a conceptual lever for implementing new ones. Clarifying the meaning and purpose of curriculum integration in any instance is therefore important for both conceptual and practical reasons.

There are three broad ways in which the meaning of curriculum integration has been laid out within the literature: as one side of a dichotomy, as part of a continuum, and as part of a multidimensional typology. One example of each will be reviewed in detail here.

(i) Although there are earlier accounts of the meaning of integration (e.g., Dressel, 1958), one of the classic and most conceptually sophisticated analyses of the concept in a sociological as well as a philosophical sense, is to be found in Bernstein's (1971) discussion of the classification and framing of educational knowledge. *Classification* refers to "the degree of boundary maintenance between contents". *Frame* refers to "the degree of control teachers and pupil possess over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and reviewed in the pedagogical relationship". Particular combinations of classification and framing produce different kinds of curriculum or educational knowledge codes. Bernstein describes the two forms of these as *collection code* and *integrated code* curricula.

Collection code curricula are characterized by strong classification and strong framing. Boundaries between contents or subjects are strong and teachers have little opportunity to transgress them. Students tend to have little control over what is taught. *Integrated code* curricula are characterized by weak classification and framing. Boundaries between contents or subjects are weak and blurred. Students have much more discretion over what is learned.

The meaning that Bernstein attaches to integration is quite precise. Integration does not mean abolishing subjects, or indulging in vaguely conceived themes.

> "It is important to be clear about the term 'integrated'. Because one subject uses the theories of another subject, this type of intellectual interrelationship does not constitute integration . Integration, as it is used here, refers minimally to the *subordination* of previously insulated subjects *or* courses to some *relational* idea, which blurs the boundaries between the subjects."

Integration may take place within subjects or across them but the subordination of the practice of integration to a high level relational principle such as genetic and cultural codes as a basis for integrating sociology and biology, is essential. Loosely constructed topics and themes are insufficient. There are several implications of this rigorous and robust conception of integration:

- There must be high ideological consensus among the teachers participating in integration;

- This high level agreement *reduces* discretion between teachers, but *increases* discretion of students;

- The contributing subjects must be linked at a high conceptual level, not through low level pragmatic themes;

- clear and distinctive criteria of evaluation should exist;

- "Integration reduces the authority of the separate contents, and this has implications for existing authority structures". Integration threatens existing structures of power and control inside and even perhaps outside education.

Bernstein's theory has received a lot of support through the empirical study of department politics and subject histories (see Chapter 7). It has helped to clarify the meaning of integration, has proposed how typical aspects of integration cluster together under certain social conditions, and has shown that the meaning of integration has socio-political dimensions as well as philosophical ones.

A problem with Bernstein's theory, however, is its dualistic, either/or nature. It establishes a clear dichotomy between integration and non-integration (collection) (see also Shoemaker, 1989). This creates a value polarity which suggests implicit distribution of good and bad practice as opposing, exclusive alternatives. Thus, where Bernstein's theory is used as a reference point for empirical study or a guide for practice, failure to meet *all* criteria of the integrative ideal amount not to distinctive curricular patterns of their own but to 'failed' or 'false' integration in the form of 'disguised collection', for instance (Walker and Adelman, 1972). Dichotomies in this sense, present choices and distinctions that are too bald and simplistic. Integration and specialization are not straight alternatives. What *kind* of integration is desired is a more sophisticated and meaningful choice.

(ii) Some conceptual analyses of integration see it not as one half of a polarity, but as an arrangement of points on a continuum. A study by Munn and Morrison (1984) arranges practice that passes for integration among teachers and subjects along a continuum that includes *coordination* of separately taught elements, and full blown *collaboration* at the level of practice.

Such a continuum, like all continua, allows finer discriminations to be made between different forms of integration than is permitted by polar opposites. Continua like these can be attractive to administrators for they can allow schools and their teachers to monitor progress along the continuum over time, through different forms or levels of integrated practice.

The use of such continua, as in innovation profiles (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1987), or levels-of-use models (Hall and Loucks, 1978) can be valuable if the behaviours being monitored are singular rather than multiple, and simple rather than complex. They can allow progress to be monitored with precision and validity. But sometimes, the urge to measure and to manage can obstruct the search for meaning. This happens when complex and disparate behaviours are clustered together into a single level or stage; behaviours that might not always belong together at all. This can lead to misunderstanding and mismanagement. A second point about continua is that the values underpining what is to count as growth or progress should be explicit and agreed. Progress along a continuum does not guarantee continuation towards progress. Moreover, these values should be reflected across *all* the components at each particular level. With complex, multi-faceted behaviours, this is again difficult if not impossible to achieve.

As we shall see, what passes for curriculum integration takes many forms. In some of these forms, greater degrees of integration may actually be more harmful than valuable, and amount to regression, not growth. More than this, the multiple forms that integration can take, means that any single continuum of integration will be descriptively invalid. Defining integration in such a way that it can be arranged along a continuum of stages or levels is appealing to those who want to manage and monitor the process of implementation. But management should not prevail over meaning. Indeed, ignoring the complex meanings of integration is likely to lead to mismanagement and misunderstanding.

(iii) The final pattern through which understandings of integration have been constructed, is that of a typology. Case (1991a) has developed a particularly sophisticated typology of curriculum integration that is arranged along several dimensions.

These are:

- Four forms of integration:

- of content (e.g., environmental studies)
- of skills/processes (e.g., writing skills in social studies)
- of school and self (i.e., relevance)
- holistic (of underlying - e.g., Catholic-principles into the curriculum)

- Two dimensions of integration

- horizontal (between contents at any one time)
- vertical (within contents over time - also known as 'continuity' and 'progression' (Kelly, 1990)

These two dimensions are often in conflict.

- Four objectives of integration

- to address important issues that cannot always be neatly packaged in existing subjects
- to develop wider views of their subjects among students
- to reflect 'the seamless web' of knowledge
- to increase efficiency and reduce redundancy of content

- Four modes of integration

- fusion of formerly separately taught elements (e.g., English and Social Studies)
- insertion of one element into a larger set (e.g., Novel Study into History)
- correlation between elements that remainseparately taught (e.g., reference to hypotheses in history and science)
- harmonization of different skills, concepts, etc. across separately taught elements.

- Three loci of integration

- provincial
- school or district
- classroom

The items on the dimensions of this typology are not always compatible (e.g., vertical and horizontal integration needs are often in conflict), stronger realizations of them are not always worthwhile (e.g., some contents may be easily confined

within existing subjects rather than contrived across them), and not all combination of different items will lead to curricular coherence, observes Case.

These last observations reveal the strengths and weaknesses of typologies for analyzing possible patterns of curriculum integration. They make it easier to discriminate among the complexities of integrative practice. They do not subordinate the necessity for complex meaning and careful description to a singular continuum embodying growth-based norms that are amenable to managerial control. They do not, however, explain how and why particular aspects of integration usually cluster together in particular ways, nor what it is that accounts for these patterns. They do not explain why some patterns of integration are common and some are not; why some are easy and some are hard. Conceptually open typologies of this kind can, however, be useful maps for empirical study and practical improvement if they are also combined with sophisticated understandings of how and why particular patterns of integration emerge in particular ways.

Practice

Curriculum reform policies and implementation plans are often constructed in ways that assume relatively ideal and easily replicable school conditions where the reforms will be situated. Yet the world of schools is a messy, unpredictable and highly contextualized one, far from ideal, nor even easily isolated into discrete variables that might be described and controlled as "implementation problems" (Ball and Bowe, 1991). Sometimes it is just that there are not enough laboratory resources to be shared or that there are too many part-time teachers to get together and meet, etc. that undercuts the intentions of educational reform (Hamilton, 1973, 1975). There *are* some more broadly occurring and applicable problems of implementing integration, though, that do apply widely across different settings (e.g., Weston, 1979; Olson, 1983; Skelton, 1990; Rudduck, 1991; Werner, 1991a).

These are:

- The coexistence of parallel curriculum requirements of a more conventional, specialized nature at a higher level of the school or educational system more widely. This can reduce teacher commitment to integration.

- The persistence of traditional patterns of assessment and assessment requirements, leading to teacher anxiety about the results and accountability of integration.

- Parental pressure for traditional academic standards and subject-based qualifications.

- The presence of staff who have developed long-standing attachments to their specialities, resulting in resistance to integration.

- The importance of maintaining senses of boundary for personal identity, and of being aware that seemingly trivial changes in responsibility for content can amount to major transformations in personal identity.

- The extent to which the pace of change in moving to integration can underestimate the strength of subject-based traditions in forming teachers' identities.

- The danger, where integration constitutes a program within a school, of it balkanizing staff into 'insiders' and 'outsiders', and thereby creating resentment among those who feel excluded from the reform.

- The problems of bureaucratization, where integration initiatives expand, creating difficulties in meeting, planning and completing other business together.

- The need for incentives, financial and otherwise, to get some staff involved and committed.

- Problems of burnout among teachers finding themselves pressed for the continuing need to prepare new materials, assessment instruments, etc., especially where no additional time in-school is provided for this.

- Threats to staff promotion across schools where these are predominantly subject-based, by involvement in integration, which is not.

- Need for long term planning; an argument against swiftly implemented patterns of reform.

- Need for a clear sense of practicality and of improvement in learning and student performance, to secure the commitment of many teachers.

- Need for the development of a culture of school collaboration, in which integration itself can be developed.

Conclusion

This analysis raises important implications for those embarking upon curriculum integration. In particular:

- There is a need to achieve clarity in how integration is defined. Vagueness can secure early agreement and commitment but only at the cost of later frustration and confusion.

- It is important that integration is defined in robust ways, around high level principles, and not just in terms of loosely conceived themes and topics that are pragmatically appealing.

- Integration takes many forms. Not all of these lead to progress and improvement. Integration can be a bad thing as well as a good one.

- Because the form of integration adopted in a school is one of many possible forms, the values underpinning the kind of integration chosen should be made explicit - so it is clear what such integration is meant to achieve.

- Because integration is complex and multi-faceted, its implementation should not be managed and monitored according to levels-of-use, or stages-of-growth models that are better suited to more simple behaviors and processes.

- The implementation problems surrounding integration, of the kind listed above, need to be addressed with sincerity and a sense of realism.

References

Adelman, N.E. (1989). *The case for integrating academic and vocational education.* Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Allen, R.R. & Kellner, R.W. (1983). Putting Humpty Dumpty together again: Integrating the language arts. In *The talking and writing series, K-12: Successful classroom practices.* Washington, D.C.: Dingle Associates.

Atwood, V.A., et al (1989). In the soup: An integrative unit, Part 1. *Social Studies and the Young Learner, 2*(1), 17-19.

Ball, S.J., & Bowe, R. (1991). Subject to change? Subject departments and the 'implementation' of national curriculum policy: An overview of the issues. In Blase, J. (Ed.). *The Politics of Life in Schools,* Newbury, 6, Jage.

Barnes, D. (1982). Integrating the curriculum. In D. Barnes (Ed.). *Practical curriculum study* (pp. 121-140). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Berg, M. (1988). The integrated curriculum. *Social Studies Review, 28*(1), 38-41.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In Young, M.F.D. (Ed.). *Knowledge and control.* London: Collier-MacMillan.

Betts, F.M. (1983). A qualitative model of the integrative learning process. *Issues in Integrative Studies, 2,* 93-122.

Brent, D., et al (1985). Effective integration of computer technology into a secondary school: Writing across the curriculum. *Technological Horizons in Education, 13*(3), 103-106.

Cardinale, G. (1988). The four A's of history/social science education: A question of priorities. *Social Studies Review, 28*(1), 14-18.

Case, R. (1991a). The anatomy of curricular integration. *Forum on Curriculum Integration*. Tri University Integration Project, Occasional Paper #2. Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Case, R. (1991b). Integration around themes: An overused tool? *Forum on Curriculum Integration*. Tri University Integration Project, Occasional Paper #7. Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Clark, P. (1991). A bibliography on curricular integration: Fundamental issues and approaches. *Forum on Curriculum Integration*. Tri University Integration Project, Occasional Paper #1. Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Conklin, K.R. (1966). The integration of the disciplines. *Educational Theory, 16*, 225-238.

Connelly, C.H. (1954). Integration in the organization of curriculum. *School and Society, 80*.

Craig, C. (1987). Addressing subject integration. *History and Social Science Teacher, 23*(1), 31-34.

Dickinson, G., et al (1980). *Adult basic literacy curriculum and resource guide*. Victoria, B.C.: British Columbia Department of Education.

Dressel, P.L. (1958). The meaning and significance of integration. In N.B. Henry (Ed.). *The integration of educational experiences: 57th yearbook of the NSSE, Part III* (pp. 3-25). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Duncan, V.A. (1987). *English language arts comprehensive curriculum goals: A model for local curriculum development*. Salem: Oregon State Department of Education.

Friend, H. (1984). *The effect of science and mathematics integration on selected seventh grade students' attitudes toward and achievement in science*. New York: New York City Board of Education.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gire, J., & Poe, B. (1988). Implementing a transition-to-work model at the junior high school level. *Pointer, 32*(2), 15-17.

Goodman, K.S., Smith, E.B., Meredith, R., & Goodman, Y.M. (1987). *Language and thinking in school - A whole language curriculum*. New York: Richard C. Owen.

Greenan, J.P., & Tucker, P. (1990). Integrating science knowledge and skills in vocational education programs: Strategies and approaches. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 13*(1), 19-22.

Haase, S.E. (1981). Thoughts on an integrated approach to curriculum. *Journal of American Indian Education, 20*(3), 32-33.

Hairston, L. (1983). *Getting to the core of education in the Omaha public school system*. Nebraska: Omaha Public Schools.

Hall, G.E., & Loucks, S. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitative and personalizing staff development. *Teachers College Record, 80*(1), 36-53.

Hamilton, D. (1973). The integration of knowledge: Practice and problems. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 2*, 146-155.

Hamilton, D. (1975). Handling innovation in the classroom: Two Scottish examples. In Reid, W.A. and Walker, D.F. (Eds.). *Case studies in curriculum change*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hamre-Nietupski, S., et al (1989). Enhancing integration of students with severe disabilities through curricular infusion: A general/special educator partnership. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24*(1), 78-88.

Harter, P.D., & Gehrke, N.J. (1989). Integrative curriculum: A kaleidoscope of alternatives. *Educational Horizons, 68*(1), 12-17.

Heath, B.E. (1988). Motivating teachers to utilize the integrated and correlated approach to teaching history-social science. *Social Studies Review, 28*(1), 42-47.

Hirst, P.H. (1974). Curriculum integration. In P.H. Hirst (Ed.). *Knowledge and the curriculum* (pp. 15-132). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hunter, B. (1980). *An approach to integrating computer literacy into the K-8 curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Jacobs, H.H. (Ed.). (1989). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jewett, A.E., & Ennis, C.D. (1990). Ecological integration as a value orientation for curricular decision making. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5*(2), 120-131.

Kaltsounis, T. (1990). Interrelation between social studies and other curriculum areas: A review. *Social Studies, 81*(6), 283-286.

Kasten, K.L., et al (1989). Self-managing groups and the professional lives of teachers: A case study. *Urban Review, 21*(2), 63-80.

Kersh, M.E., et al (1987). Techniques and sources for developing integrative curriculum for the gifted. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 7*(1), 56-68.

Komski, K. (1990). Integrated learning systems take integrated effort. *School Administrator Special Issue: Computer Technology Report*, 25-27.

Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D.J. (1987). *Improving classroom practice using innovation profiles*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Mansfield, B. (1989). Students' perceptions of an integrated unit: A case study. *Social Studies, 80*(4), 135-140.

Minnesota State Department of Education (1985). *Educational effectiveness: Curriculum articulation*. St. Paul, MN.

Munn, P., & Morrison, R. (1984). Approaches to collaboration in multidisciplinary courses. *Stirling Educational Monographs No. 13* (pp. 14-16). Stirling: University of Stirling, Department of Education.

Musgrave, F. (1973). Power and the integrated curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5*(1), 3-12.

Northwestern Educational Service District (1989). *'Restructuring' schools: Integrating the curriculum*. Mount Vernon, WA.

Norton, R. (1988). Similarities between history-social science framework and English-language arts framework: What it means for elementary teachers, *Social Studies Review, 28*(1), 48-52.

Olson, J. (1983). *Innovation in the science curriculum*. London: Crom Helm.

Pappas, C.C. et al (1990). *An integrated language perspective in the elementary school: Theory into action*.

Pickard, S. (1990). Integrating math skills into vocational education curricula: Beyond providing specific occupational skills. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 13*(1), 9-13.

Pring, R. (1973). Curriculum integration: The need for clarification. *New Era, 54*(3), 59-64.

Quattrone, D.F. (1989). A case study in curriculum innovation: Developing an interdisciplinary curriculum. *Educational Horizons, 68*(1), 28-35.

Richmond, W.K. (1975). Integration or disintegration? *The Scottish Educational Journal, 58*(4), 1089.

Rudduck, J. (1991). *Innovation and change.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Rutgers, the State University, New Jersey Department of Vocational-Technical Education (1981). *Introduction to vocations: Building occupational exploration at the middle school level.* New Brunswick, NJ.

Sarkees-Wircenski, M.D., & West, L.L. (1990). Integrating basic acdemic skills in vocational education programs: A challenge for the future. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 13*(1), 5-8.

Shainline, M. (1987). *Program to integrate math and science.* Evaluation report. Alburquerque, NM: Alburquerque Public Schools: Planning, Research and Accountability.

Shoemaker, B. (1989). Integrative education: A curriculum for the twenty-first century. Oregon School Study Council, Eugene. *OCCS Bulletin, 33*(2).

Skelton, A. (1990). Towards confusion and retreat: The changing face of curriculum integration in Sheffield, 1986-90. *In-School Organization, 10*(2 and 3), 229-238.

Stahl, S.A., & Miller, P.D. (1989). Whole language and language experience approaches for beginning reading: A quantitative research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 59,* 87-116.

Stevens, P., & Lichtenstein, S. (1990). Integrating communication skills into vocational programs: Critical role of vocational educators. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 13*(1), 15-18.

Walker, R., & Adelman, C. (1972). *A guide to classroom observation.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Watts, J. (1980, August). *English in an integrated curriculum - Practice at Countesthorpe College, Leicestershire.* Paper presented at the third annual meeting of the International Conference on the Teaching of English, Sydney, Australia.

Werner, W. (1991). Curriculum integration and school cultures. *Forum on Curriculum Integration*. Tri-University Integration Project, Occasional Paper #6. Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Werner, W. (Forthcoming). Defining curriculum policy through slogans. *Journal of Education Policy*.

Weston, P. (1979). *Negotiating the curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Williams, S.E. (1980). Continuity and diversity in the classroom. *Outlook, 37*, 9-19.

Wolf, A. (1988). The new history-social science framework: Will it become a reality or remain a dream? *Social Studies Review, 28*(1), 5-13.

7.
Student Support Services in the Transition Years

Elizabeth Smyth

Background

In announcing the Transition Years initiative, the Ontario Ministry of Education made three commitments:

- To ensure a core curriculum in Grades 7, 8, and 9 that meets the needs of adolescents.
- To eliminate levels of difficulty in Grade 9.
- To provide students with appropriate support as they make decisions about future education and work.

For purposes of this review, the last of these commitments is taken to be the working definition of student support services: those structures and personnel within a school community assisting students in gaining the knowledge and skills they need to make informed decisions concerning aspects of their personal life, academic future and career possibilities. Such student support services were an important part of the research agenda, results of which are reported in Volumes 2 and 3 of the larger study, of which this review is a part. The Ministry of Education was especially concerned that this research address two questions:

- How should schools organize and ensure appropriate career and educational planning for students in the Transition Years?
- How should programs and services for personal and social counselling be organized and delivered for students in the Transition Years?

To assist decision making in schools and school boards, the Ministry of Education commissioned two reviews of the literature concerning the student experience within the Transition Years. *Making Connections: Guidance and Career Education in the Middle Years* (Levi & Ziegler, 1991) describes the "actual and

recommended policies, programs and practices" (p.v.). *Rights of Passage: A Review of Selected Research About Schooling in the Transition Years* (Hargreaves & Earl, 1990) explores current directions in programs and services, examined within a context of change.

Making Connections uses as its sources of information a review of international literature and the data reported in the 1990 Ontario Guidance Survey. The authors organized the data they collected from the review of the literature and from the results from the 1990 Ontario Guidance Survey around six key statements about effective guidance/career education programs (p. 7).

This chapter does not duplicate or replace the information found in *Making Connections*. Rather, its purpose is to provide a brief overview, highlighting some additional sources which readers may wish to examine for further study, especially in light of the framework suggested in *Rights of Passage*.

Rights of Passage: A Review of Selected Research About Schooling in the Transition Years utilizes three basic principles as a guide:

- Programs and services for the Transition Years should primarily be based on the characteristics and needs of early adolescents in our society.
- The different aspects of schooling should be dealt with as an integrated system.
- The development and implementation of any change should be based upon theories and understanding of educational change.

These principles seem quite appropriate in the delivery of programs and services for personal/social counselling and career/educational planning.

The issues and resulting practices surrounding the design and implementation of student support service which will adequately meet the personal/social counselling and career/educational planning needs of early adolescents are the focus of this component of this literature review. This is a selective review which draws on the research and effective practices literature concerning effective student support services from the ERIC and Canadian Education Index data bases. Thus, it focuses primarily on conference proceedings, published results of sponsored

research, and research published in professional journals. For the most part, the review is limited to research carried out in Canada, the United States and Australia.

This review is limited in another, more critical, way. The provision of adequate student support services to early adolescents is a complex issue to explore. By its very nature, any discussion of student support services encompasses many of those challenges which contemporary schools and society are attempting to address. In other words, the provision of student support services raises those myriad of concerns which fall under the broad category of "students at risk" -- those students whose needs are inadequately being met: potential dropouts (Bergmann & Baxter, 1983; Bhaerman & Kopp, 1988); exceptional students (Werner, 1987); multicultural students (Christiansen, 1982; Griffiths, 1987); sexually active/teenage parents (Burt & Sonenstein, 1984; Dorman, 1982;Ortiz & Basoff, 1985; Simpson, K. et al, 1986; Volusia County Schools, 1987; Whipple, 1987; Wright, 1987); girls with low self-confidence and self-expectations (Brutsaet, 1989; Celkis, 1981; Roberts 1986; Roberts & Newman 1987; Gilligan et al.1990; Robertson, 1990); depressed/suicidal students (Lipsitz,1980; Morrison, 1983); substance abusers (Snyder et al, 1984; Horan, 1990); victims of abuse; homosexual youth (Rofes,1989).

Each of these categories could easily be the focus of its own lengthy review. Furthermore, such analyses of each of these categories could explore the specialized needs of these "at risk" students mentioned above, which must be considered in the planning and organizing of appropriate personal/social counselling and career/educational exploration programs. Not to discount the importance of these students nor the magnitude of their needs, this chapter concentrates on the provision of support services for students whose needs are identified as being in the mainstream.

Adolescence is a complex period of physical, cognitive, social and emotional growth. The needs of adolescents have been well defined in the literature and can be summarized as the need to:

- adjust to profound physical, intellectual, social and emotional changes;
- develop a positive self-concept;
- experience and grow toward independence;

- experience social acceptance, affiliation and affection among peers of the same and opposite sex;
- increase their awareness of, ability to cope with and capacity to respond constructively to the social and political world around them;
- establish relationships with particular adults within which these processes of growth can take place. (Hargreaves & Earl, 1990)

Exemplary practice in student support services which provide early adolescents with personal/social counselling and assist them in career/educational planning must be responsive to these needs. Much personal and social counselling will aim to assist adolescents to develop a positive self concept while adjusting to profound changes of many types: such career/educational counselling also will assist in the acquisition of independence and preparation to take a place in the larger community and ultimately in the world of work.

That educators must recognize and build adequate support systems which will address these needs has been the focus of many provincial and state initiatives within the past decade. Yet, focusing on these needs and providing mechanism to ensure these needs are met are quite different challenges.

A broad consensus exists in the literature that present practices and current models for delivery of support services to early adolescents need to be improved. This includes greater recognition of the need to provide ongoing systematic support to early adolescents in a form that is structured to their characteristics and needs (Ohio State Department of Education 1988, 1989; New York State School Boards 1987; Bergmann & Baxter, 1983). Effective practices should be an integral part of the school program while focusing on both home and the wider community in a collaborative effort to meet the guidance and counselling needs of early adolescents (Lipsitz & Lefstein, 1983). Further, there is consensus that more effective practice is needed to involve parents and guardians in guidance and counselling programs (Lipsitz, 1980; Farel, 1982; Harvey & Schaufele, 1983; Huhn & Zimpfer, 1984; Miller, 1987). Finally, a significant component within the literature indicates that change in teachers' practice is necessary in order to assist teachers in developing skills and strategies effectively to meet the needs of early adolescents in the areas of personal/social counselling and career/educational planning (Schmelter, 1980;

Cantwell, 1982; Lipsitz, 1983; Little & Shulman, 1984; Queensland Board of Teacher Education, 1984; Cassidy, 1985).

Practices developed and reported in the literature will be the focus of the remaining portion of this review.

Exemplary Practices

In Canada, provincial ministries of education have independently supported the production of documents for teachers. These documents have addressed the delivery of support services to meet the needs of early adolescents (Alberta, 1987; Kesten for Saskatchewan, 1987; Osborne for Manitoba, 1984; Ontario,1984). With the release of *Ontario Schools: Intermediate and Senior Divisions (OSIS)* (1984), the Ontario Ministry of Education mandated that a minimum of 20 hours be dedicated to guidance services in both grade 7 and grade 8. For the most part, elementary schools are not staffed with full time counsellors. Guidance services tend to be delivered by the regular classroom teachers or are included within the duties assigned to the administrative team. To assist classroom teachers incorporating guidance activities into their programs, the Ministry of Education distributed a support document entitled *One Step at a Time: Educational and Career Explorations* (1984) which, in addition to the objectives stated in the title, contains personal counselling activities to prepare students socially and emotionally for secondary school life. While such a resource is available, it is a support document and its use will vary considerably across the province. Yet, it appears that teachers in the intermediate division feel that they are inadequately skilled to directly deliver such guidance services to students.

In one study, Cassidy (1985) reported that, from a sample of 172 experienced intermediate/junior high school teachers in southern Ontario who responded to a survey, the majority reported a need for further specialized professional training in the characteristics and needs of early adolescents. Cassidy also reported that the majority of respondents indicated that they felt inadequately prepared for teaching in the intermediate division because their preservice education program lacked specialized coursework about the needs of early adolescents.

Cassidy's study serves as a focus for further discussion. It is neither the first nor the latest to identify weaknesses in the preparation of teachers for service within the intermediate/junior high years. Teacher education, both preservice and inservice, has long been identified as a critical factor in building effective student support services in the transition years. Schmelter (1980), Cantwell (1982) and Lipsitz (1983) suggest that teachers are not adequately prepared in their preservice education to program for early adolescents. More critically, Lipsitz suggests that once in school, teachers can expect no help from the misused school guidance system (Lipsitz, 1983). Little & Shulman (1984) also stress the need for more research in teacher education and development to prepare teachers to more effectively meet the cognitive and affective needs of early adolescents by increasing both their repertoire of instructional strategies and their understanding of their pupils.

Within the United States, the issue of providing adequate support services to students in the transition years have been addressed through state departments of education both sponsoring and supporting the growth of middle school and junior high school associations and sponsoring conferences and meetings to assist schools and counsellors in developing schools' guidance improvement plans, goals and statement of expected outcomes. (New York State School Boards,1987; Schnelker et al.for Iowa (1986) In addition, American researchers writing for the centres for the study of early adolescents and other agencies have suggested a number of strategies to adequately provide student support services for early adolescents.

The *Transitional Schools: Report of Evaluation* documents the implementation of the Transitional School Model in Des Moines, Iowa and suggests a practice which deserves further exploration. The objective of this three year study was to ease the transition between grades 6-8 and high school through an emphasis on the physical,emotional, social and intellectual development of the students. Schnelker et al (1986) reported that each school in the Independent Community School District developed its own program which integrated teachers counsellors and extracurricular activities. The student experience was structured into seven class periods which covered the basic skills and an exploratory curriculum. An eighth class of 20-30 minutes focused on advisory activities concerning the personal development of the students. The evaluators reported that the students received a more comprehensive program than that of a traditional junior high school with a slight increase in student achievement.

As found in many other states and provinces, Gassman and Deutch (1990) prepared for Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction a workbook entitled "Increasing Options through Life/Work Planning" a ten module series of workshops which aim to develop the student's individual potential, assist in the development of self-fulfillment, explore vocational and career aspirations and examine strategies for achieving an effective family life.

The involvement of parents and guardians in guidance and counselling programs is the focus of a significant amount of literature. The need for school counsellors to provide effective parent education is the focus of several studies. Miller (1987) explored parental and teacher expectations of early adolescence. Among the findings of the study was the need for further parent inservice to more completely understand the nature of the early adolescent and the need for increased cooperation and communication between school and home. Farel (1982) and Huhn & Zimpfer (1984) outlined two programs for counsellors to effectively deliver training to parents of early adolescents. Parent education seems even more critical in light of the findings of Harvey & Schaufele (1983) who reported that mothers are more favoured helpers than peers or counsellors among early adolescents.

Perhaps one of the most useful collections of materials on theory, research and effective practice is a recent publication from the American Association for Counselling and Development. In*The Challenge of Counselling in Middle School* (1990), O'Rourke has collected 33 articles which address issues and suggest strategies to ease the transition of students from the intermediate years to secondary school. Within the individual chapters, a number of authors outline approaches to assist early adolescents in meeting those frequently identified needs of enhancing self-concept; improving decision-making skills; enhancing their peer and parental relationships and improving their academic skills.

The chapter "The Challenge of Organizing a Middle School Counselling Program" contains five articles which O'Rourke has selected to illustrate two sides of the counselling process. These articles propose parallel strategies to deliver counselling programs to students and to assist beginning middle school counsellors. Arnold (1990) describes a program whereby a teacher meets with 12-20 students on a regular basis to lead the group in activities which promote student growth. Peace

(1990) describes a program whereby an experienced teacher meets with 12-20 beginning middle school counsellors to work with them on a regular basis dealing with issues and challenges which they are meeting.

The use of teacher-based guidance groups as an effective strategy for providing student support in the transition years is reported several times in the literature. One variation of this strategy is the Byram Hills School District's (1988) "Walking Advisement Program" (renamed T.A.C. Thoughts About Crittenden), a program which has operated for four years at Crittenden Middle School in Armonk, New York. Based on the work of University of Wyoming professor Alfred Arth, this program is a means to bring together a small group of students with a teacher-advisor on a regular basis to work through a scripted discussion guide on issues relevant to the students' experience.

In *The Challenge of Counselling in Middle School*, O'Rourke (1990) provides an array of methods and resources enabling students to explore the issue of career choice and job-search skills through drama, fantasy-role playing, family-centered, student-centered and teacher-centered activities. There are a variety of activities presented and the emphasis is on community-based resources. O'Rourke discusses the sequence of steps taken by the counsellor and the teacher who worked collaboratively to design and deliver this effective program.

O'Rourke also describes strategies to assist counsellors and teachers in enabling early adolescents to come to self-understanding. Among the strategies described is journal writing. Bibliotherapy is also discussed in another chapter: Kahn and Khan (1989) take this strategy one step further by suggesting that ITABs (I am the Author Books) is another counselling technique which can effectively be used by teachers and counsellors to assist students in expressing themselves and exploring troublesome issues.

Conclusions

The literature touched on in this paper argues for attention to four sets of questions when attempting to assess the provision of effective support services - services which, by definition, should assist students in gaining the knowledge and skills to make informed decisions concerning aspects of their personal life, academic

future and career possibilities. While these questions do not, by any means, offer distinct guidelines for exemplary practice, they do focus attention on critical issues for Transition Years initiatives:

- Where are the needs of early adolescents identified? By whom are these needs to be addressed?

- To what extent has a systematic approach to meeting the personal/social counselling and career/educational planning needs of early adolescents been set out? How is this approach supported by implementation strategies?

- To what extent are the personal/social counselling and career/educational planning needs of early adolescents addressed in the regular classroom? What provisions are set out for integration of these needs into the regular program? Under what circumstances has the regular classroom teacher received specialized training or other support in the necessary curriculum development skills and the counselling skills to meet these student needs?

- To what extent are the personal/social counselling and career/educational planning needs of early adolescents addressed by specialized teachers in specialized programs? Are these programs delivered to students by a site-based or an itinerant teacher? What opportunities are there for further re-enforcement of these needs within the students' regular program?

The literature concerning the provision of student support services to early adolescents is rich. Within it is a consensus that the anchor of effective programs is the extent to which these programs meet the identified needs of adolescent learners. Much less is known from this literature, however, about how such programs should be implemented; how they should be integrated into the regular school program; how teachers and counsellors should be prepared to deliver such programs and services and how the effectiveness of such programs and services can be evaluated. It is therefore essential that the literature on curriculum implementation and on school change also be consulted when establishing criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of student support services within the Transition Years.

References

Alberta Department of Education (1987). *Transition to secondary schooling: A monograph of ideas for principals and teachers.* Edmonton: Author.

Arnold, J. (1990). Teacher based guidance: The advisor/advissee program in O'Rourke, K. (Ed.) *The challenge of counseling in middle school.* Ann Arbor: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services.

Bergmann, S. (1989). *Discipline and guidance: A thin line in the middle school.What at risk students say about middle level school discipline and teaching.* Reston,Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Bergmann, S., & Baxter, J. (1983). Building a guidance program and advisory concept for early adolescents. *NASSP Bulletin, 67* (463), 49-55.

Berla, N., et al. (1989). *The middle school years: A parents' handbook.* Columbia, Md: National Committee for Citizen's in Education.

Bhaerman, R., & Kopp, K.(1988). *The school's choice: Guidelines for dropout prevention at the middle and junior high school.* (Dropout Prevention Series). Columbus,OH: National Centre for Research in Vocational Education.

Brutsaert, H.(1990). Changing sources of self-esteem among girls and boys in secondary schools. *Urban Education 24*(4), 32-39.

Burt, M., & Sonenstein, F. (1984). *Planning adolescent pregnancy programs: Implications of a national evaluation.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Byram Hills School District. (1988). *Walking advisement: Program description.* Armonk. NY: H.C. Crittenden Middle School.

Cassidy, G. (1985). The void in teacher education: Preparing teachers for the intermediate/junior high. *Education Canada 25* (1), 16-22.

Cantwell, Z. (1982). *Development at early adolescence: Implications for continuing professional and preprofessional education of teachers.* Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn College, School of Education.

Celkis, R. (1981). *Achievement motivation and the vocational development of adolescent women: A review and application of achievements motivation research to vocational development theory.* (review literature 070)

Christiansen et al. (1982). *West Indians in Toronto.* Toronto: Ministry of Citizenship and Culture.

Dorman, G., et al. (1982). *Conference on early adolescence: Living with 10 to 15 year olds; Parents and young adolescents; Talking about sex; Risk taking behaviour and others.* Chapel Hill, NC: Centre for Early Adolescence.

Farel, A. (1982). *Early adolescence: What parents need to know.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: Centre for Early Adolescence.

Gassman,R., & N. Deutch. (1990). *Increasing options through life/work planning.* Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Gilligan, C. et al (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School.* Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press.

Griffiths, C. (Ed.) (1987). *Northern youth in crisis: A challenge for justice.* Burnaby,B.C.: Simon Fraser University.

Hargreaves, A., & Earl, L. (1990). *Rights of passage: A review of selected research about schooling in the transition years.* Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Harvey, C., & Schaufele, D. (1983). Concerns and help-seeking in early adolescents. *School Guidance Worker 39*(2), 10-13.

Horan, J., et al. (1990). *A world of drug abuse.* Ann Arbor: ERIC Clearing house on Counselling and Personnel Services.

Huhn, R., & Zimpfer, D. (1984). The role of middle and junior high counselors in parent education. *School Counselors* 31(5),357-65.

Kahn,B., & Kahn, W. (1989). *Expressive writing in counselling: Student authored books*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Counselling and Development.

Kesten, C. (1987). *Independent learning: A common essential learning*. Prepared for the Saskatchewan Department of Education Core Curriculum Investigation Project. Regina: Faculty of Education, University of Regina.

Levi, M., Ziegler, S., & McElvy, B. (1991). *Making connections: Guidance and career education in the Middle Years*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Lipsitz, J. (1980, January). *Schooling for young adolescents: A key time in secondary education*. Testimony Prepared for the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, C.D. Perkins,Chair. Carrboro, NC: Centre for Early Adolescence.

Lipsitz, J. (1981, March). *Early adolescence: Social/psychological Issues*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. St. Louis, Mo.

Lipsitz,J., & Lefstein, L. (1983). *3:00 to 6:00 P.M.: Programs for young adolescents*. Chapel Hill NC: Centre for Early Adolescence.

Little, J.W., & Shulman, J. (1984). *The instructional and professional environment of middle schools: Guidance for teacher education*. San Francisco: Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development.

Miller, C. (1987, April). *Parent expectations for adolescent transitions: What they are and how they affect their children*. Paper Presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. Baltimore, MD.

Morrison, J. (1983, February). *Insomnia among adolescents: Implications for counselors.* Paper presented to the Annual meeting of California Personnel and Guidance Association. Los Angeles, CA.

New York State School Boards Association. (1987), *Meeting in the middle: Directions in schooling for young adolescents.* Albany: Author

Osborne, K. (1984). *Middle years sourcebook: Some suggestions for the early education of adolescents.* Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Education.

Ohio State Department of Education. (1989). Opening all options. *Proceedings of the Ohio Middle School and Junior High School Career Guidance Conference. June 28-30 1988.* Columbus, OH: Author.

Ohio State Department of Education. (1988). Opening all options. *Proceedings of the Ohio Middle School and Junior High School Career Guidance Conference. June 24-26 1987.* Columbus, OH: Author.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1989). *Ontario schools: Intermediate and senior division.* Toronto: Author.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1984). *One step at a time: Educational and career explorations.* Toronto: Author.

O'Rourke, K. (Ed.). (1990). *The challenge of counseling in middle school.* Ann Arbor: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services.

Ortiz, E., & Basoff, B. (1985). *Adolescent welfare mothers: Lost optimism and lowered expectations.* Research Report (143).

Peace, S.D. (1990). A mentor program for beginning middle school counselors in O'Rourke, K.(Ed.). *The challenge of counseling in middle school.* Ann Arbor: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services.

Queensland Board of Teacher Education. (1984). *The education of young adolescents: Implication for schooling and teacher education.* Toowong: Author.

Roberts, L. (1986, March). *Gender differences in patterns of achievement and adjustment during early adolescence.* Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence. Madison, WI.

Roberts, L., & Newman, J. (1987, April). *Gender differences in the relationship between perceived popularity and self-image during early adolescence.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association. Arlington, VA.

Robertson, H., et al. (1990). *A capella.* Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation.

Rofes, E. (1989). Opening up the classroom closet: Responding to the educational needs of gay and lesbian youth. *Harvard Educational Review 59*(4), 444-53.

Schmelter, R.C.(1980). *A needs assessment for the development of a program for the training of teachers of pre and early adolescents.* Oshkosh: University of Wisconsin.

Schnelker, D., et al. (1986). *Transitional schools. Report of evaluation.* Des Moines Public Schools: Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing.

Simpson, K., et al. (1986). *Economic development planning for single parents: Curriculum materials for vocational teachers of adolescents and single parents.* Lexington: Kentucky University.

Snyder, G., et al. *Preventing alcohol problems through a student assistance program: A manual for implementation based on the Westchester County, New York Model.* Rockville, Md.: National Institute in Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

Volusia County Schools. (1987). *Volusia County single parents program.* Final report 1986 to 1987. Daytona Beach, FL: Author.

Werner, D. (1987). *Disabled village children: A guide for community health workers, rehabilitation workers and families.* Palo Alto: Hesperian Foundation.

Whipple, V. (1987). *Career education and training for teen parents program.* Final Report. Malta, Ill: Kiskwaukee College.

Wright, S. (1987, November). *Self-protection: A new approach to 4-H health.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Minnesota Council on Family Relations. St. Paul, MN.

8.
Conclusion: Leadership For Restructuring Schooling In The Transition Years[1]

Kenneth Leithwood

Evocative images of desirable practice are powerful guides for action without prescribing exactly what that action ought to be. "Instructional leadership" is one such image for school administration: it is an image which has served well the needs of many schools through the 1980's and early 1990's. Given the substance of current restructuring initiatives such as those underway in the transition years in Ontario, however, "instructional leadership" no longer appears to capture the heart of what school administration will have to become. In this chapter, I argue that "transformational leadership" evokes a more appropriate range of practices; it ought to subsume instructional leadership as the dominant image of school administration at least during the '90's. The chapter reviews relevant aspects of the transformational leadership literature.

Restructuring Schools and Leadership

Sarason (1990) has claimed that the "predictable failure of educational reform" rests, in large measure, on existing power relationships in schools: relationships among teachers and administrators, parents and school staffs, students and teachers. His view is widely held. Most initiatives which fly the restructuring banner advocate strategies for altering power relationships, for example, as implementing school-site management, increasing parents' and teachers' participation in decision making and enhancing opportunities for the exercise of teacher leadership (e.g., Sykes, 1991). In these respects, the restructuring of schools appears analogous to the groundshift in large businesses and industries begun more than a decade ago. To use labels made popular by Ouchi (1981) at that time, this ground shift is from Type A toward Type Z organizations. Type A organizations, very useful for some situations and tasks, centralize control and maintain differences in status between workers and managers and among levels of management; they also rely on top-down decision processes. Such organizations, including the traditional school, are based on "competitive" (Roberts, 1986) or "top-down" (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991)

power. This is the power to control - to control the selection of new staff, the allocation of resources, the focus for professional development and the like. One cannot give away this form of power without loosing one's share. It is a zero sum gain.

In contrast, Type Z organizations, the aspiration for restructured schools, rely on strong cultures to influence peoples' directions and reduce differences in the status of organizational members. Participative decision-making is emphasized throughout Type Z organizations as much as possible. Such organizations are based on a radically different form of power. This is "consensual" and "facilitative" in nature, a form of power manifested *through* other people not *over* other people. Such power arises, for example, as teachers are helped to find greater meaning in their work, strive to meet higher level needs through their work, and develop enhanced instructional capacities. Facilitative power arises also as school staffs learn how to make the most of their collective capacities in solving school problems. This form of power is unlimited, practically speaking, and substantially enhances the productivity of the school on behalf of its students. While most schools rely on both top-down and facilitative forms of power, finding the right balance is the problem. For restructuring schools, solving this problem will usually mean moving closer to the facilitative end of the power continuum.

Large, non-educational organizations have usually undertaken this Type A toward Type Z groundshift not out of concern for individual rights or social justice. Rather, such a shift has demonstrably positive effects on their productivity, an effect also hoped for in restructured schools. As Sarason explains in defense of greater teacher participation in decision making:

> ...when a process makes people feel that they have a voice in matters that affect them, they will have greater commitment to the overall enterprise and will take greater responsibility for what happens to the enterprise (1990, p. 61).

At least the impression of instructional leadership created by much of the effective schools research has encouraged a continuing emphasis on top-down power by school administrators.

The term instructional leadership also focuses administrators' attention on "first-order" changes; improving the technical, instructional activities of the school, through the close monitoring of teachers' and students' classroom work. Yet serious efforts to unpack the practices of so-called instructional leaders ascribe considerable importance to such "second-order changes" as building a shared vision, improving communication and developing collaborative decision-making processes (e.g., Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986; Duke, 1987; Smith & Andrews, 1989). These are tasks also associated with restructuring schools.

Our growing appreciation of the change process has taught us that schools are complex systems comprised of parts with greater interdependencies than we earlier believed. Successful "first-order" changes usually depend on the support provided through significant "second-order" changes. Failure to acknowledge this complexity is the second reason Sarason (1990) offers for the predictable failure of educational reform. Restructuring initiatives are primarily about second-order changes and require leadership with a similar focus.

Transformational Leadership

An evocative image of leadership for restructuring schools needs to focus the attention of school administrators on the use of facilitative power and second-order changes in their schools. "Transformational leadership" provides such a focus. As Roberts explains:

> This type of leadership offers a vision of what could be and gives a sense of purpose and meaning to those who would share that vision. It builds commitment, enthusiasm, and excitement. It creates a hope in the future and a belief that the world is knowable, understandable, and manageable. The collective action that transforming leadership generates, empowers those who participate in the process. There is hope, there is optimism, there is energy. In essence, transforming leadership is a leadership that facilitates the redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of their commitment, and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment (1985, p.1024).

Most discussions of transformational leadership contrast it with a form of leadership called "transactional". This is leadership premised on an exchange of services (from a teacher, for example) for various kinds of rewards (salary,

recognition and other, more intrinsic rewards) which the leader controls, at least in part. Transactional leadership practices, some claim, help people recognize what needs to be done in order to reach a desired outcome. It may increase their confidence and motivation, as well.

Transformational and transactional leadership practices are often viewed as complementary. Both Bass (1987) and Sergiovanni (1990) consider transactional practices to be central in maintaining the organization - getting the day-to-day routines carried out. Such practices do not stimulate improvement, however. The incentive for people to attempt significant improvements in their practices is stimulated through experiencing transformational leadership practices, also. This is why Aviolio & Bass (1988) refer to transformational leadership as "value added".

The idea of transformational leadership was proposed in a mature form first by Burns (1978) and subsequently extended in non-educational contexts by Bass, his associates and many others. Systematic attempts to explore the meaning and utility of such leadership in schools have only recently begun, however, and very little empirical evidence is available about its nature and consequences in such contexts. My colleagues and I have recently completed three studies in an ongoing series aimed at addressing these issues. This research has been conducted in schools initiating reforms of their own choice, as well as in schools responding to both school system and provincial initiatives.

Results of our studies suggest that transformational school leaders are in more or less continuous pursuit of three fundamental goals. Results also begin to identify practices used to accomplish these goals, a number of which appear to serve multiple purposes.

Goal One: Assist Staff In Developing and Maintaining A Collaborative, Professional School Culture

In such cultures, staff often talk, observe, critique and plan together, they also teach one another how to teach better because of norms of collective responsibility and continuous improvement (Little, 1982; Hargreaves, 1990). Evidence demonstrating the contribution of collaborative cultures to both school improvement and school effectiveness is reasonably convincing. Our own case

study of 12 improving schools identified five sets of practices used by their leaders to assist staff in building and maintaining collaborative professional cultures (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1991).

• *Strengthening the school's culture:* Because school cultures are typically quite weak (i.e., there is not much consensus on "what we stand for around here"), they remain of little consequence in bringing about significant school reform even when they reflect aspects of collaboration. Such weakness is a function of: ambiguous, excessive, poorly specified purposes; the isolation of teachers; and, low levels of commitment by staff to the school's purposes (Firestone & Wilson, 1985). All principals in our study engaged in some process to clarify, and prioritize a set of shared goals of their school improvement initiatives. This often involved entire school staffs in a process for setting goals, initially as well as efforts throughout the life of many projects to block competing priorities and systematically orient new staff to the goals for school improvement. Reducing teacher isolation was accomplished by providing opportunities for staff to influence one another, such as the creation of time for joint planning and sometimes requiring interaction (e.g., creating working committees assigned specific tasks). Finally, teacher commitment was stimulated quite directly and forcefully in at least four of the cases. Teachers were given the option, after reasonable opportunities to understand the schools' purposes, to stay in the school and devote themselves to those purposes or transfer, with the principal's assistance, to another school with priorities more in tune with their own.

• *Using bureaucratic mechanisms:* Such mechanisms sometimes support cultural changes by making them easier to accomplish or more rewarding in which to engage. Examples of the use of these mechanisms by principals in our study included finding new money, providing time for planning during the workday, establishing divisional committee structures, and selecting new staff based on improvement priorities.

• *Communicating cultural norms, values and beliefs:* Active communication of the culture is an especially opportune strategy for principals because of the large proportion (as much as 75%) of their time spent in interpersonal contact. School administrators in our study frequently used such words as "informing", "persuading", "directing", "writing", "negotiating", "counselling", "visiting", and

"discussing" to indicate the prevalence of this set of practices and the importance they attached to it in developing and maintaining a collaborative school culture.

• *Sharing power and responsibility with others:* Central to the concept of a collaborative culture is equitable distribution of power for decision-making among members of the school. Especially when the focus of decision-making centres on cross-classroom and school-wide matters, this will involve school administrators at least delegating, if not giving away, sources of power traditionally vested in their positions. The most obvious way school administrators in our study went about sharing power and responsibility was through the establishment of school improvement teams of which they were sometimes members. These teams shared the responsibility for project coordination with principals and assisted principals in many of the strategies already mentioned. Also, these teams served as important links between staff and administration, testing plans and soliciting reactions and ideas. Individual members of these teams often acted as mentors or role models for their colleagues. They shared expertise, tried out new ideas in their classes and encouraged conversation about the school improvement effort.

• *Using symbols to express cultural values:* Symbols are visible expressions of the content of an organization's culture. Manipulating such symbols and rituals, therefore, is a way to make more visible those aspects of the culture that leaders believe are valuable. In our study, principals explicitly mentioned three ways in which they used symbols and rituals to foster collaboration. At staff meetings and assemblies principals celebrated and publicly recognized the work of staff and students which contributed to school improvement efforts. This action invited others to share in the successes of their colleagues. Principals also wrote private notes to staff expressing appreciation for special efforts. This action demonstrated to individuals the value attached to some practices by the principal and the possibility of recognition by an esteemed colleague. Staff were encouraged, thirdly, to share experiences with their colleagues, both as a source of stimulation for colleagues and also for recognition by other adults.

Each of these ways of using symbols and rituals have the potential of contributing to an increase in teachers' professional self-esteem. According to Rosenholtz's (1989) research, increased self-esteem enhances the likelihood that teachers will feel "safe" in revealing their work to others.

Goal Two: Creating Conditions Which Give Rise To The Motive and Opportunity For Teacher Development

Transformational leaders use the everyday acts associated with their school improvement efforts to foster teacher development. One of our recent studies suggests five set of practices which motivate teachers to pursue such development (Leithwood, Jantzi & Dart, 1991). These practices and examples of the specific form they may take include:

- *Assisting teachers in developing a set of internalized purposes or goals for professional growth:* This occurs, for example, when school leaders ensure teacher participation in establishing a school mission and a set of related goals for the school which they find personally meaningful. Developed in this way, such school goals provide a framework and stimulus for teachers to use in developing a set of personal professional growth goals;

- *Ensuring that the purposes for professional growth are clear and explicit:* School leaders can meet this condition by inviting teachers' participation on committees with responsibility for both refining and helping to pursue each of the broad school goals;

- *Helping teachers set goals that are ambitious enough to be challenging but not so ambitious as to be unrealistic:* Encouraging ongoing discussion of school goals by teachers seems to avoid the adoption by teachers of either trivial or excessively ambitious personal growth goals;

- *Identifying with teachers short range goals instrumental to the achievement of long range goals:* This happens when subgoals are developed for each element of the school's mission statement and become the basis of a school growth plan. Participating in the development of such a group process stimulates parallel efforts by individual teachers in relation to their personal growth goals;

- *Helping teachers detect discrepancies between goals and current states:* Team planning activities, informal collaboration and collegial feedback, as well as a more formal, end-of-year assessment of progress, models the kind of evaluation at the

school level in which teachers need to engage as individuals. As well, these school level activities result in feedback to individuals from other colleagues.

Opportunities for professional development are available in the school to the extent that teachers participate with others in authentic, non-routine activities focused on school improvement. More specifically, according to our study, these opportunities depend on:

- *Providing for the active engagement of teachers in practical problem solving:* Such engagement can be a product of involvement in all categories of decisions about the purposes and means for school improvement;

- *Ensuring that new practices are introduced at a challenging but comfortable pace:* The pace tends to remain comfortable when teachers are able to control it in a way that makes sense to them; the pace remains challenging when decisions about it belong to the group (few individuals remain immune to pressure from peers to change at a reasonable pace);

- *Ensuring that the activities in which teachers are engaged are authentic:* This occurs when teachers share with the principal the task of determining the school's mission, identifying priorities for action and developing strategies to address these priorities, for example.

- *Engaging teachers in non-routine problems:* For example, a staff retreat for the purpose of developing a mission statement for their school can help teachers to look at their school in a new way;

- *Creating a supportive school culture for teacher development.*

Goal Three: Enhancing the Collective and Individual Problem Solving Capacities of Staff

For significant school reform to occur, staffs sometimes want to and often have to work harder. Their engagement in new activities beyond classroom instruction make this inevitable and transformational leadership is valued by some because it stimulates such "extra effort" (Sergiovanni, 1991). But our third study of

transformational school leaders uncovered practices which they used primarily to help staff work smarter, not harder (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991). This was a study of how such leaders solved problems in collaboration with teachers during staff meetings.

Since Herbert Simon (1957) applied the term "bounded rationality" to the limitations of an individual's problem solving capacities, significant effort has been devoted to discovering the conditions under which many heads are better than one. One person possesses limited information, can only think about a few ideas at one time, and brings all manner of personal biases to their thinking. Several people thinking together potentially are able to arrive at better solutions through a form of "collegial rationality" (Shulman & Carey, 1984). The conditions which foster collegial rationality and the practices in which principals in our study engaged during staff meetings to create such conditions included:

- *Introducing a broader range of perspectives* from which to interpret the problem by actively seeking staff interpretations, being explicit about their own interpretations and placing individual problems in the larger perspective of the whole school and its overall directions.

- *Developing an expanded array of solutions* for the problem by assisting group discussions of alternative solutions, ensuring open discussion and avoiding commitment to preconceived solutions.

- *Making available better information* about the context in which the problem is to be solved by actively listening to staff views and by clarifying and summarizing information at key points during meetings.

- *Avoiding narrowly biased perspectives* on the problem by keeping the group on task, not imposing their own perspectives, changing their own views when warranted, checking out their own and others assumptions and remaining calm and confident.

These practices seemed to be based on a genuine belief in the likelihood that the staff as a group could develop better solutions than the principal by herself, a belief apparently not shared by the non-transformational leaders in our study.

Transformational leaders also created conditions during staff meetings likely to stimulate improvements in the problem solving of individual participants. These conditions are premised on the claim that individual problem-solving capacities are an internalization of previously experienced collaborative problem- solving processes. Individual capacities are improved through such collaborative processes when group processes are superior to individual processes. Principals in our study planned carefully, in advance, for how group problem solving would occur; they actively facilitated group problem solving as well as anticipating and planning for constraints. Individual capacities are also improved when there are opportunities for conscious reflection on group processes. Principals met this condition by outlining explicitly to the staff the process for problem solving, planning for follow-up and gently keeping the group on task. Finally, when individuals have opportunities to compare their own processes to those of the group, their capacities improve. Principals in our study did not meet this condition (there is always room for growth).

Conclusion

What hard evidence is there that transformational leadership makes a difference? In the context of non-educational organizations, the evidence is both substantial and positive. But only a handful of studies in educational settings, in addition to our own, have been reported (e.g., Murray & Feitler, 1989; Roueche, Baker & Rose, 1989; Roberts, 1985; Kirby, King & Paradise, 1991; Hoover, Petrosko & Schulz, 1991). One of our studies, a case analysis in 12 schools (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1991) demonstrated a sizeable influence of transformational practices on movement toward greater teacher collaboration, an effect paralleling the findings of Deal & Peterson (1990). A second study (Leithwood, Jantzi & Dart, 1991), using survey data collected from staffs in 47 schools, confirmed these results and demonstrated highly significant relationships between aspects of transformational leadership and teachers' own reports of changes in both attitudes toward school improvement and altered instructional behaviour. This study, furthermore, reported little or no relationship between transactional (control-oriented) forms of leadership and teacher change, a finding also recently reported by Blase (1990). In sum, evidence regarding the effects of transformational educational leadership is quite limited but uniformly positive; clearly, it warrants giving such leadership considerable more attention in the context of restructuring the transition years.

Note

[1] An abbreviated version of this chapter has been published in *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-10.

References

Aviolo, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership,charisma, and beyond. In B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachter, & C.A. Schriesheim, In *Emerging leadership vistas*. Toronto: Lexington Books.

Bass, B.M. (1987). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Blase, J.J. (1990). Some negative effects of principals' control-oriented and protective behavior. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*(4), 727-753.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Deal, T., & Peterson, K. (1990). *The principals role in shaping school culture.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Duke, D.L. (1987). *School leadership and instructional improvement*. New York: Random House.

Dunlap, D.M., & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27*(1), 5-29.

Firestone, W.A., & Wilson, B.L. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(2), 7-30.

Hargreaves, A. (1990). *Individualism and individuality: Reinterpreting the teacher culture.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April.

Hoover, N.R., Petrosko, J., & Schultz, R.R. (1991). *Transformational and transactional leadership: An empirical test of a theory*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Kirby, P., King, M., & Paradise, L. (1991). *Extraordinary leaders in education: Toward an understanding of transformational leadership.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

Leithwood, K.A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 8-10.

Leithwood, K.A., & Jantzi, D. (1991). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 1*(3), 249-281.

Leithwood, K.A., Jantzi, D., & Dart, B. (1991). *How the school improvement strategies of transformational leaders foster teacher development.* Paper presented at the teacher development conference. Vancouver, B.C.

Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.J. (1986). *Improving principal effectiveness: The principal profile.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Leithwood, K.A., & Steinbach, R. (1991). Indicators of transformational leadership in the everyday problem solving of school administrators. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4*(3), 221-244.

Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal, 19*(3), 325-340.

Murray, F., & Feitler, F.C. (1989). *An investigation of transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness in small college settings.* Prepared for presentation at the 1989 annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Ouchi, W.G. (1981). *Theory Z Reading.* MA: Addison-Wesley.

Roberts, N. (1986). Organizational power styles: Collective and competitive power under varying organizational conditions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22*(4), 443-458.

Roberts, N. (1985). Transforming leadership; A process of collective action. *Human Relations, 38*(11), 1023-1046.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace.* New York: Longmans.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. & Rose, R.R. (1989). *Shared vision.* Washington: The Community College Press.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1991). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership.*

Shulman, L.S., & Carey, N.B. (1984). Psychology and the limitations of individual rationality: Implications for the study of reasoning and civility. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(4), 501-524.

Simon, H. (1957). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations.* New York: Free Press.

Smith, Wilma, F., & Andrews, R.L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference.* Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sykes, G. (1990). Organizational policy into practice: Reactions to the cases. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(3), 243-247.

Part 2:

French Language Review

Diane Gérin-Lajoie

9.
Les écoles de langue française

Diane Gérin-Lajoie

** Laurette Lévy a assumé la recherche bibliographique pour chacun des thèmes à l'étude. Diane Gérin-Lajoie en a rédigé le texte final.

Les pages qui suivent portent sur l'éducation de langue française en Ontario et reprennent les différents secteurs de concentration tels que présentés dans la section précédente par nos collègues anglophones.

Comme on pouvait s'y attendre et les expériences antérieures le démontrant, la littérature qui existe sur la situation de l'éducation de langue française en milieu minoritaire est plus limitée que dans le cas de l'éducation de langue anglaise en milieu majoritaire, tant au niveau théorique, qu'au niveau empirique. Il est à noter cependant que la présente recension des écrits met surtout l'accent sur les études empiriques, et ce, pour deux raisons :

. La première réside dans le fait que la plupart des recherches effectuées sur des aspects précis de l'éducation franco-ontarienne s'avèrent plus empiriques que théoriques.

. La deuxième raison est que nous ne voulons pas répéter ce qui a déjà été élaboré dans la section précédente en ce qui a trait aux divers cadres conceptuels qui sous-tendent les secteurs de concentration à l'étude et que l'on retrouve dans la littérature. Ces mêmes cadres conceptuels sont, dans la plupart des cas, utilisés également dans la recherche en langue française.

Il nous semble important de mettre plutôt l'accent sur la situation spécifique de l'éducation de langue française telle que présentée par les chercheurs et les chercheuses spécialisés dans le domaine. Nous avons en effet délibérément choisi de nous en tenir à ce qui s'est fait dans la province pendant les dix dernières années au niveau de l'éducation minoritaire de langue française. Ce survol nous a permis

de voir où nous en sommes rendus dans les différents secteurs de concentration à l'étude. Ajoutons également que les écrits recensés ne touchent pas uniquement les années de transition, mais qu'ils portent aussi, dans bien des cas, sur les années de spécialisation. Il nous a quand même semblé nécessaire de présenter ces écrits étant donné l'importance des sujets traités et de leur relation directe aux années de transition.

Tout comme nos collègues anglophones, nous nous sommes penchées sur les secteurs de concentration suivants : la participation de la collectivité, le programme de base, la formation en cours d'emploi, l'organisation scolaire, les techniques d'évaluation et le soutien à l'élève.

La recension a été effectuée à partir des sources de références suivantes : *Liste des publications des membres du Centre de recherches en éducation franco-ontarienne (CREFO), Onteris, EDUQ,* la liste des acquisitions du CREFO et finalement, le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l'IEPO. La banque de données EDUQ ne nous a fourni que très peu d'information en ce qui a trait à l'éducation de langue française en milieu minoritaire. C'est pour cette raison que nous avons décidé de mettre plutôt l'accent sur le matériel franco-ontarien disponible dans les domaines à l'étude.

Les pages qui suivent présentent chaque secteur de concentration séparément.

10.
L'évaluation

Quand on parle d'évaluation, on peut considérer plusieurs domaines :

- l'évaluation des programmes,
- l'évaluation du matériel scolaire,
- l'évaluation des enseignantes et des enseignants,
- l'évaluation des élèves, qui peut se répartir en deux sous-domaines : celui des tests standardisés et de l'évaluation sommative et celui de l'évaluation individualisée formative.

Bien que la recension des écrits ayant trait à l'évaluation porte surtout sur celle des élèves, nous voulons, ici, signaler certains ouvrages qui sont du domaine de l'évaluation des programmes, du matériel scolaire et des enseignantes et enseignants. Encore une fois, il s'agit en très grande partie de recherches empiriques sur la situation dans les écoles de langue française de l'Ontario.

La recherche effectuée par Churchill et al. en 1985 sur l'éducation de langue française en Ontario demeure toujours l'une des plus importantes. Dans cette étude diagnostique des problèmes inhérents à l'éducation de langue française en Ontario, on formulait les suivantes :

- que le gouvernement favorise et encourage le développement et le maintien de la communauté franco-ontarienne par le biais de son système d'éducation;

- que le gouvernement apporte des changements structurels dans le domaine de l'éducation postsecondaire de langue française;

- qu'on incite la population franco-ontarienne à conserver la langue et la culture françaises au foyer d'abord.

Des évaluations de divers programmes et de matériel didactique ont aussi été effectuées dans les écoles de langue française. Cazabon et Girouard (1989), par exemple, ont évalué le Projet d'excellence pédagogique pour les francophones du

nord-est de l'Ontario en portant une attention particulière sur le profil de l'enseignant et de l'apprenant, sur le cadre d'apprentissage, sur l'évaluation et sur le projet de changement planifié. Rancourt et Dionne (1982) se sont intéressés aux styles d'enseignement et d'apprentissage dans les écoles de langue française de l'Ontario.

Anderson et al. (1989) ont effectué une évaluation d'un programme innovateur d'enseignement individualisé dans une école secondaire mixte du nord de l'Ontario. Les résultats ont démontré que le programme a eu des effets bénéfiques sur la composante de langue française de l'école. En effet, l'enseignement individualisé a permis un plus grand choix de cours pour les élèves. Dans le cadre de l'enseignement traditionnel, la plupart de ces cours auraient été voués à une disparition certaine, étant donné le peu d'élèves inscrits au programme de langue française.

Frenette (1980), de son côté, s'est intéressé à l'analyse de contenu de certains manuels scolaires en usage dans les écoles de langue française de la province. Il est arrivé à la conclusion que l'image de l'élève franco-ontarien qui est véhiculée par les manuels d'enseignement du français est celle d'un élève sage, qui a les bonnes réponses et qui parle bien, peu curieux, peu imaginatif et peu enclin à remettre en question ce qui l'entoure. Frenette a aussi constaté dans cette analyse de contenu que le niveau de complexité des échanges linguistiques n'était guère plus élevé en 9e année que dans les premières années de scolarité et que la langue populaire des Franco-Ontariens était implicitement rejetée.

À cause de la complexité de la situation des écoles de langue française dans la province, il s'avère essentiel de réévaluer constamment ce qui s'y passe.

Comme Colomb et Marsnach (1989) l'ont déjà souligné, l'évaluation devrait être considérée non seulement comme un moyen privilégié de validation d'un enseignement, mais également comme un axe stratégique de transformation des pratiques. C'est en effet en évaluant les pratiques éducatives que l'on est amené à apporter les changements nécessaires à leur amélioration.

Quant à l'évaluation de l'élève, une enquête européenne menée par Weston et Evans (1988) a souligné la nécessité d'une évaluation plus constructive. On y

recommande également d'insister davantage sur l'évaluation formative, de personnaliser le rythme d'apprentissage et de faire de l'élève un partenaire.

Le thème de l'évaluation formative est de plus en plus populaire dans le domaine de l'éducation. En effet depuis quelques temps déjà, le ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario insiste dans ses programmes-cadres sur l'importance de l'évaluation formative de l'élève. En matière d'évaluation formative, la Banque d'instruments de mesure de l'Ontario, communément appelée BIMO, qui a été développée par une équipe de chercheurs et chercheuses de l'Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario et qui a été complétée en 1991 présente une grande utilité pour les écoles de langue française. Les instruments qui ont été créés sont faciles à reproduire pour la salle de classe. Ils s'intègrent à la pratique de la pédagogie de la communication. Ces instruments se retrouvent dans les pratiques suivantes : la production écrite et orale, l'interprétation de l'écrit et le travail d'équipe.

La notion d'évaluation formative repose donc sur des pratiques pédagogiques changées, sur une conception différente de l'apprentissage. C'est un processus qui appel à la réflexion. Les élèves doivent, en effet, y participer activement pour comprendre leur façon d'apprendre autant que le contenu étudié. De plus, on insiste que les élèves participent à leur propre évaluation et celle de leurs pairs, non seulement en s'évaluant mutuellement mais en participant aussi au choix des critères d'évaluation. De cette façon, l'élève détient plus de responsabilité dans son processus d'apprentissage.

L'évaluation formative a entraîné également un changement dans le format des bulletins que les parents reçoivent. On y trouve maintenant des commentaires et des observations beaucoup plus détaillés non seulement sur le développement cognitif, mais aussi sur le développement social et affectif des élèves.

Pour être en mesure d'évaluer le processus d'apprentissage de leurs élèves, les enseignantes et les enseignants doivent recevoir la formation en cours d'emploi qui leur permettra de se servir avec succès de cette forme d'évaluation.

Quelques études ont été effectuées en ce qui a trait au rendement scolaire des élèves fréquentant les écoles de langue française de l'Ontario. Desjarlais et al. (1979)

ont fait l'analyse des tests standardisés en français et en mathématiques utilisés pour les élèves de 7e et 8e années. Cette étude a mené aux résultats suivants :

- les tests administrés ne couvraient pas plus de 20 % des objectifs des programmes-cadres;

- les enseignantes et les enseignants de 7e et 8e années préfèrent l'évaluation continue effectuée avec une variété de méthodes;

- Il existe un manque de tests standardisés, mais d'après l'enquête effectuée, les éducatrices et les éducateurs ne sont pas prêts à en élaborer de nouveaux.

Les auteurs concluaient en disant que la notion d'évaluation comme partie essentielle de l'enseignement et de l'apprentissage n'était pas encore très répandue chez les éducatrices et les éducateurs de la province.

D'autres études ont aussi porté sur les mathématiques (Churchill et al., 1987; Ladouceur et Hanna, 1985) et sur le français (Béniak et Mougeon, 1979; Frenette et al., 1981).

On a dénoncé les tests utilisés pour évaluer les élèves franco-ontariens (Canale, 1984; Canale et al., 1983) car ceux-ci étaient donnés dans leur langue d'origine, soit l'anglais ou ils étaient tout simplement traduits en français, ces tests ne répondant donc pas à la réalité des élèves testés. On a insisté, finalement, sur la nécessité de former les éducatrices et les éducateurs à l'évaluation (Canale et al., 1983; Morgan, 1987; Lawton et al., 1984).

Bibliographie

Anderson, S. et al. *Une étude de cas du Projet Excellence.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1989.

Béniak, É. et R. Mougeon. *Évaluation d'unités pédagogiques destinées à l'enseignement du français langue maternelle en Ontario.* Toronto : CREFO, Institut d'Études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1979.

Canale, M. «A communicative approach to language proficiency assessment in a minority setting», dans *Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency assessment: research and application.* Clevedon, Angleterre : Multilingual Matters. 1984.

Canale, M. et al. *Rapport sur le projet de loi 82 : problèmes linguistiques en milieu minoritaire franco-ontarien.* Toronto : CREFO, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1983.

Cazabon, B. et A. Girouard. *Bilan de la situation d'apprentissage.* Sudbury : Centre du Moyen-nord, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1989.

Churchill, S. et al. *Éducation et besoin des Franco-Ontariens : le diagnostic d'un système d'éducation : Volume 1 : Problèmes de l'ensemble du système : l'élémentaire et le secondaire.* Toronto : Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne. 1985.

Churchill, S. et al. *La classe et son environnement dans les écoles franco-ontariennes.* Toronto : Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1987.

Colomb, J et J. Marsenach. "Évaluation", *dans Étapes de la recherche.* Paris : INRP. 1989.

Desjarlais, L. et al. *L'évaluation du rendement scolaire (cycles intermédiaire et supérieur) : étude analytique des instruments de testing employés pour*

évaluer les progrès des élèves aux cycles intermédiaire et supérieur. Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1979.

Frenette, N. *Une grille d'analyse pour l'analyse des activités langagières suscitées par les manuels scolaires.* Toronto : CREFO, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1980.

Frenette, N. et al. *L'évaluation de l'écrit : français 9ème et 10ème années : projet-pilote.* Toronto : CREFO, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1981.

Ladouceur, A. et G. Hanna. Communication donnée sur la comparaison entre les questionnaires anglais et français dans les tests de mathématiques. Université d'Ottawa et Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1985.

Lawton, S. et al. *L'élaboration et l'application de l'évaluation du rendement des éducateurs certifiés dans les conseils de l'Ontario : rapport non technique.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1984.

Morgan, G. A. «L'évaluation du rendement dans les systèmes scolaires de l'Ontario», dans *Bulletins détudes et d'évaluation.* Vol. 6. Numéro 3. Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1987.

Rancourt, R. et J. P. Dionne. *Une étude des styles d'enseignement et d'apprentissage dans les écoles de l'Ontario.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1982.

Weston, P. et A. Evans. *Évaluation, certification et besoins des jeunes.* Enquête européenne et rapport de conférence. National foundation for Educational Research. 1988.

11.
La formation en cours d'emploi

Comme il a déjà été mentionné dans la recension des écrits de nos collègues anglophones, nous sommes intéressés à découvrir ce qui se fait en termes de formation en cours d'emploi, tant au niveau des politiques qu'au niveau des pratiques dans la salle de classe, pour les enseignantes et les enseignants impliqués dans les différents projets pilotes des années de transition afin de brosser un tableau actuel de ce qui existe en la matière. Bien que les recherches qui ont eu cours ces dernières années touchent le système en général, il nous sera utile de voir où les écoles de langue française de la province en sont rendues en ce qui a trait au perfectionnement des maîtres.

Fullan et Connelly (1987) dans leur rapport sur la réforme de la formation des enseignants et des enseignantes en Ontario commandité par le ministère de l'Éducation soulignent que les programmes de formation en cours d'emploi ont reçu beaucoup d'attention de la part des spécialistes et du public en général au cours des dernières années. Il n'en demeure pas moins, selon les auteurs, que les programmes présentent certains problèmes qu'il faut arriver à résoudre si l'on veut que le perfectionnement professionnel soit efficace. Ces problèmes sont entre autres:

- les programmes de formation en cours d'emploi sont plutôt des ateliers intensifs qui ne conduisent pas nécessairement à l'amélioration du programme;

- souvent le contenu ne corrrespond pas à la réalité des enseignantes et des enseignants auxquels il s'adresse;

- les enseignants et les enseignantes n'ont que peu ou pas d'occasion de mettre en pratique ce qu'ils ont appris;

- les enseignants et les enseignantes ne jouissent pas toujours du soutien administratif voulu;

- les programmes ne font pas souvent appel aux connaissances de base de l'enseignement;

- il y a un manque de motivation de la part des enseignantes et des enseignants à approfondir leurs connaissances.

Déjà en 1986, Park et Fullan avaient soulevé des inquiétudes face aux faiblesses du programme de perfectionnement professionnel, à la surcharge de travail et au manque de cohésion entre les partenaires de l'enseignement.

En ce qui concerne la formation en cours d'emploi dans les écoles de langue française, Fullan et Connelly (1987) poursuivent en disant qu'on doit tenir compte du contexte minoritaire quand on parle de la formation des enseignantes et des enseignants. En effet, selon eux, «... l'enseignement franco-ontarien a longtemps été caractérisé par un sentiment de mission linguistique et culturelle, mission qui est sans cesse redéfinie en raison de l'évolution constante de la communauté...» (p. 48). Cela a donc pour résultat de créer des exigences particulières par rapport à l'enseignement dans les écoles de langue française.

D'autres auteurs ont aussi indiqué que la communauté franco-ontarienne souffre d'isolement à cause de son éparpillement géographique et que l'hétérogénéité de ses conditions de vie rend difficile dans certains cas l'élaboration d'une vision commune (Mougeon et Heller, 1986; Heller 1987; Welch, 1988).

Frenette (1988) lors de son enquête sur les besoins des enseignantes et enseignants franco-ontariens en matière de formation, tirait en effet les conclusions suivantes :

> la distance s'avère le facteur le plus important dans la décision d'entreprendre ou de poursuivre un programme de formation en cours d'emploi;
>
> il existe un manque de services notoire pour les enseignantes et les enseignants au niveau de la formation;

il existe un besoin d'information en ce qui concerne la formation disponible dans les universités et la formation disponible ailleurs, comme par exemple dans les conseils scolaires.

La littérature semble donc indiquer des besoins particuliers en ce qui concerne la formation en cours d'emploi pour les enseignantes et les enseignants des écoles de langue française de l'Ontario.

Certaines auteures soulignent aussi le fait que la formation que reçoit le personnel enseignant s'adresse plutôt aux milieux majoritaires (Heller, 1986; Gérin-Lajoie, 1991). Il faut donc établir des mesures de soutien afin d'amener les nouveaux enseignants et enseignantes à comprendre les relations sociales qui prennent place dans le groupe minoritaire (Gérin-Lajoie, 1991).

D'autres recherches mentionnent la nécessité de formation en cours d'emploi dans les domaines particuliers de l'informatique (Michaud, 1986) et de l'enseignement du français (Cazabon et Frenette, 1982; Béniak et al., 1984; Frenette, 1981). En ce qui concerne le français, il est important, selon ces auteurs de reconnaître l'authenticité du français populaire parlé par les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes, ce qui n'est pas toujours le cas dans les écoles. Les enseignantes et les enseignants auraient donc besoin d'être sensibilisés à cette réalité.

Il faut aussi noter que, dans le but de remédier au manque de formation en cours d'emploi, le ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario a mis sur pied un programme de perfectionnement professionnel appelé « Projet d'excellence pédagogique » s'adressant spécifiquement aux francophones et dont l'objectif est d'aider les enseignantes et les enseignants des élèves franco-ontariens au processus d'apprentissage (Courte, 1989).

Mentionnons finalement qu'un projet de formation en cours d'emploi a été réalisé pendant l'année scolaire 1990-1991 dans un conseil scolaire de la région de Toronto (Heller et Lévy, 1991). Le Centre de recherche en éducation franco-ontarienne de l'Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario a mené une recherche-action sur la pratique critique et réflexive ainsi que sur la coopération.

Un des objectifs du projet était d'amener les enseignantes et les enseignants, en équipes, à réfléchir et à s'interroger sur leurs pratiques en salle de classe. Afin de mener à bien cette expérience, Heller et Lévy ont souligné certaines conditions à remplir : 1) le personnel enseignant participe à la définition des objectifs du programme de formation, 2) les membres des équipes s'auto-sélectionnent en fonction d'expériences commnes, 3) le travail des équipes soit intégré aux objectifs collectifs du personnel enseignant et de direction, 4) on intègre le travail d'équipe à la charge régulière du personnel enseignant, 5) on puisse avoir accès à des personnes-ressources tout au long du projet, 6) on reconnaisse le travail des enseignantes et des enseignants dans l'avancement de leur carrière.

Il semble donc important, d'après les écrits recensés, de reconnaître le travail effectué lors de la formation en cours d'emploi et de penser à des programmes spécifiques de formation amorcés par les enseignants et les enseignantes eux-mêmes.

Bibliographie

Béniak, É, et al. «A sociolinguistic and ethnographic approach to Albertan French and its implications for French-as-a-first-language pedagogy», dans *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 41 (2) . 1984.

Cazabon, B. et N. Frenette. *Le français parlé en situation minoritaire*. Volume 2. Québec : Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme. 1982.

Courte, B. « L'excellence pédagogique : ça se vit en français », dans *Orbit*. Décembre 1989.

Frenette, N. «Minority Language Education». Communication présentée au colloque «The French Experience in North America», Université du Maine à Orono. Août 1981.

Frenette, N. « Les besoins de l'éducation en situation minoritaire », dans *Échange* 16 (3). Automne 1988.

Fullan, M. et M. Connelly. *Formation des enseignants en Ontario : pratiques actuelles et choix pour l'avenir : document de prise de position*. Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation et ministère des Collèges et Universités de l'Ontario. 1987.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. « L'éducation franco-ontarienne : un besoin pressant de changement ». Communication présentée dans le cadre du Congrès de l'ACFAS (association canadienne-française pour l'avancement de la science). Sherbrooke. Mai 1991.

Heller, M. «Franco-Ontarian Education: Politic and Practice». Communication présentée dans le cadre de «The 30th Annual Reunion of the Comparative and International Education Society». Toronto. 1986.

Heller, M. « L'école de langue française à Toronto», dans *Revue du Nouvel-Ontario*. Numéro 9. 1987.

Heller, M. et Lévy. *Le developpement régional et la formation continue : une expérience de recherche-action*. Toronto : CREFO, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1991.

Michaud, P. *Incidence de la connaissance d'une langue de programmation sur la conception et l'implantation des programmes d'études*. Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1986.

Mougeon, R. et M. Heller. «The social and historical context or minority French-language schooling in Ontario», dans *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 7 (2, 3). 1986.

Park, P. et M. Fullan. *Curriculum Ontario 1986 : questions sur le perfectionnement professionnel*. Toronto : Fédération des enseignants de l'Ontario, comité des études en éducation. 1986.

Welch, D. *The social construction of Franco-Ontarian interests towards French-language schooling*. Thèse de doctorat inédite. Graduate Department, University of Toronto. 1988.

12.
Le soutien à l'élève

Toujours dans l'esprit de la refonte de l'éducation, le ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario s'est fixé l'objectif « d'améliorer le soutien offert aux élèves lors de la transition de l'école élémentaire à l'école secondaire et des années de transition aux années de spécialisation » (Ministère de l'Éducation, 1990, p. 6).

Les mesures prises par le gouvernement de l'Ontario ont été une réponse directe à l'inquiétude soulevée par diverses recherches suggérant que le taux élevé de décrochage chez les jeunes au secondaire était dû en grande partie aux problèmes auxquels les élèves de 7ème, 8ème et 9ème années font face (Lawton, Leithwood et al., 1988; Karp, 1988).

La présente section portera sur le phénomème particulier du décrochage chez les jeunes dans les écoles de la province, plus particulièrement chez les jeunes francophones. Nous considérons, en effet, que le taux de décrochage est en relation directe avec les services de soutien à l'élève que les écoles de la province devraient fournir à sa clientèle scolaire.

La raison pour laquelle nous avons décidé de parler de ce problème en particulier vient du fait que le décrochage est un phénomène alarmant surtout parmi les élèves francophones et avec lequel le système d'éducation de l'Ontario doit transiger. Le taux de décrochage en général est en effet supérieur à 30% dans la province (Radwanski, 1988).

La situation est encore plus critique chez la population scolaire de langue française. Une étude effectuée par Quirouette en 1986 démontrait que des 1368 garçons de 9ème année qui avaient participé à l'enquête, 42% d'entre eux avaient été dépistés comme décrocheurs; chez les filles, le taux était de 33% sur une population recensée de 1345.

De tels nombres nous amènent à nous questionner sur l'efficacité des services de soutien disponibles à l'élève dans les écoles en général et plus particulièrement dans les écoles de langue française.

Mais qui sont les décrocheurs ? Ils sont souvent issus de familles à niveau inférieur à la moyenne ainsi que de parents divorcés et ils proviennent surtout du sud-ouest et du nord de la province (Sullivan, 1988). Ils sont inscrits dans les cours de niveaux général et fondamental (Sullivan, 1988; Quirouette, 1986). En effet, on constate que seulement 12% des élèves inscrits au niveau avancé décrochent contre 62% et 79% des élèves inscrits aux niveaux général et fondamental (Radwanski, 1988). Le décrocheur est souvent un élève peu porté vers les études, ou un élève de rendement moyen qui ne demande pas d'aide; c'est souvent aussi un jeune qui travaille à temps partiel (Karp, 1988).

Les raisons pour lesquelles les jeunes décrochent ont généralement à voir avec leur insatisfaction en ce qui a trait à l'attitude des enseignants vis-à-vis d'eux, l'éventail de cours disponibles, ainsi que les matières qui leur avaient été enseignées au moment de l'abandon des cours (Sullivan, 1988). Radwanski (1988), de son côté, fait remarquer qu'il semble exister une corrélation entre l'abandon scolaire et les difficultés d'apprentissage, de même que le travail à temps partiel de plus de 15 heures par semaine. Karp (1988) ajoute à ces facteurs celui de l'attrait du marché du travail pour ces jeunes. En effet, le marché du travail devient, en quelque sorte, une gratification immédiate pour les jeunes, en obtenant, d'une part, un salaire et d'autre part, en se faisant un nouveau cercle d'amis.

Comme il a été mentionné avant, le taux d'abandon scolaire est plus élevé chez les francophones qu'il ne l'est chez les anglophones. Malgré ce fait accompli, il n'en demeure pas moins que 79% des élèves francophones interrogés lors d'une enquête provinciale ont dit vouloir compléter leurs études secondaires. De ce même échantillon, 46% ont dit vouloir poursuivre des études universitaires et 32% des études collégiales (Quirouette, 1986). Dennie et Laflamme (1989) sont arrivés à peu près aux mêmes résultats dans leur étude sur les aspirations des jeunes Franco-Ontariens. La réalité est de beaucoup différente cependant. En effet, à peu près 12% des élèves francophones poursuivront des études postsecondaires (Quirouette, 1986).

D'après les écrits recensés, il existe différentes façons d'améliorer la situation face à l'abandon scolaire. Des programmes d'accueil pour les élèves du secondaire pourraient miser sur un concept de soi positif et sur le succès. On insiste également

sur la coopération entre la communauté et l'école pour mettre sur pied différents programmes pour venir en aide aux jeunes, comme par exemple, l'éducation coopérative (Beauchemin et al. 1989). On propose aussi des classes moins nombreuses, que les enseignantes et les enseignants montrent plus d'intérêt face à leurs élèves, que ces derniers reçoivent une formation spécialisée surtout pour enseigner au niveau général ainsi qu'une diminution de leurs responsabilités administratives, enfin, qu'on mette sur pied des cours qui soient plus pertinents aux élèves ainsi que plus de services d'orientation (Karp, 1988). On suggère aussi le parrainage des élèves par les enseignantes et les enseignants comme méthode d'intervention auprès des décrocheurs potentiels (Quirouette, 1986). Enfin, Sullivan (1988) arrive aux conclusions suivantes : on devrait mettre sur pied des programmes dont l'objectif serait de dépister les décrocheurs éventuels. Ces programmes viseraient à donner de l'aide et des services complémentaires à la clientèle à risques. L'auteur recommande également d'inciter les enseignantes et les enseignants à améliorer leurs méthodes d'enseignement.

Il est important de souligner que très peu est dit dans les recherches existantes sur le problème de la drogue. Nous n'avons, en effet, trouvé aucune étude touchant spécifiquement le problème de l'usage des drogues chez les jeunes francophones qui fréquentent les écoles de langue française. Il serait nécessaire, à notre avis, de remédier à la situation en effectuant de la recherche sur ce phénomène de plus en plus alarmant, étant donné que l'usage des drogues met en danger l'existence même des adolescents et des adolescentes de nos écoles aux plans physique, affectif et intellectuel. Dans ses services à l'élève, le système scolaire devrait être en mesure de fournir aux jeunes l'information nécessaire sur le sujet. Par conséquent, il est de notre avis que le ministère de l'Éducation devrait se pencher sur la question.

Bibliographie

Beauchemin, C. et al. *Faites qu'ils ne décrochent pas ! Give them a reason to stay !.* Ontario : Conseil ontarien de recherches pédagogiques. 1989.

Dennie, D. et S. Laflamme. *L'ambition démesurée : enquête sur les aspirations et les représentations des étudiants et des étudiantes francophones du nord-est de l'Ontario.* Sudbury : Collection universitaire : Série Études, Institut franco-ontarien et les Éditions Prise de parole. 1989.

Karp, E. *Le phénomène des décrocheurs dans les écoles secondaires de l'Ontario.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1988.

Lawton, S. et al. *L'élaboration et l'application de l'évaluation du rendement des éducateurs certifiés dans les conseils scolaire de l'Ontario : rapport non technique.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1988.

Ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. *Les années de transition : guide de réflexion et de réponse : refonte de l'éducation : première étape de consultation.* Toronto. Octobre 1990.

Quirouette, P. *Décrocheurs francophones : une étude du dépistage des décrocheurs probables au sein des écoles secondaires françaises de l'Ontario, étape 1.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1986.

Radwanski, G. *Étude sur le système d'éducation et les abandons scolaires en Ontario.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1988.

Sullivan, M. *Analyse comparative des décrocheurs et des non-décrocheurs dans les écoles secondaires de l'Ontario.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1988.

13.
L'organisation scolaire

** Nous tenons à faire remarquer qu'il a été extrêmement difficile de trouver des écrits sur l'organisation scolaire en relation avec les écoles de langue française de l'Ontario. La rareté des écrits sur le sujet nous a contraintes à une revue très sommaire de la question. Il est de notre avis que plus de recherche dans ce domaine serait souhaitable.

Dans le cadre de la refonte de l'éducation annoncée en avril 1989, le gouvernement de l'Ontario s'est donné, entre autres, comme objectif, pour les années de transition, de décloisonner les niveaux de difficulté en 9e année. Cette mesure amènera donc une restructuration complète au niveau de l'organisation scolaire. Nous entendons ici par «organisation scolaire» la structure organisationnelle de l'école.

L'organisation scolaire ne se limite pas, bien entendu, uniquement aux années de transition ou même, à l'école comme unité de fonctionnement. Nous reconnaissons en effet que, dans une perspective plus large, la gestion scolaire des écoles de langue française fait également partie de l'organisation scolaire et que plusieurs études ont porté sur le sujet (Lalonde et Kipp, 1982; ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario, 1983; Fédération des enseignants, 1983; Godbout, 1987).

Néanmoins, étant donné le contexte de la présente étude, qui est d'analyser les pratiques qui ont cours dans les projets des années de transition à travers la province, nous avons choisi de nous pencher sur la microstructure de l'école et de voir de quelles façons son organisation influencera les relations qui s'établissent entre ses divers participantes et participants. De plus, nous ne nous limiterons pas uniquement aux conséquences du décloisonnement des niveaux de difficulté en 9e année. Nous nous pencherons également sur certaines expériences innovatrices qui ont amené une réorganisation de l'école et de la salle de classe.

Certaines écoles bilingues et de langue française de la province, par exemple, ont mis sur pied des programmes qui ont demandé une réorganisation complète de leur système scolaire. Anderson et al. (1989) ont fait l'étude d'un projet d'enseignement

individualisé d'une école mixte du nord de l'Ontario. L'école possède des centres d'apprentissage pour chaque matière, à l'intérieur desquels les élèves peuvent se prévaloir d'un enseignement individualisé. À son arrivée à l'école, l'élève se voit assigné à un groupe-conseil formé d'élèves de tous les âges et d'une enseignante ou d'un enseignant. Chaque cours est composé de vingt modules que l'élève répartit à sa guise pendant l'année scolaire.

Ce programme a demandé un changement en profondeur de tout le curriculum, de l'organisation de l'école, du rôle des enseignantes et des enseignants de même que celui des élèves face à leur apprentissage.

Dans son étude sur les programmes en cours pour les années de transition, Boich et Whitfield (1990) rapportent d'autres programmes qui ont demandé une réorganisation complète de l'école. Le programme d'une école de langue française de la province, par exemple, offre un programme éducatif de concentration et de décloisonnement pour les matières suivantes : mathématiques, sciences et initiation à l'apprentissage. Le but de cette innovation est de rendre accessible l'apprentissage de ces matières, mais surtout d'offrir plus de chances de succès aux francophones dans ces domaines. Ce programme innovateur tente d'apporter une réponse au problème du décrochage chez les jeunes francophones en essayant de les intéresser aux matières scientifiques. C'est à partir du volontariat des enseignantes et des enseignants que le programme a été mis sur pied.

Lorsqu'on analyse les projets innovateurs qui ont cours dans les écoles de la province, on se rend facilement compte que, pour réussir, les projets qui demandent une restructuration complète de leur organisation doivent s'assurer qu'un système d'appui est mis en place pour tous les acteurs de l'école : les élèves, le personnel enseignant, le personnel administratif et le personnel de soutien.

Le personnel administratif et le personnel enseignant, entre autres, devront être en mesure de mener à bien la mise en oeuvre du projet. Selon Park et Fullan (1986), il existe un rapport étroit entre le perfectionnement professionnel des enseignantes et des enseignants et le processus de refonte des programmes scolaires. Selon eux, les faiblesses des programmes actuels de perfectionnement professionnel, la surcharge de travail et le manque de cohésion entre les différents partenaires de l'enseignement ralentissent, et parfois même, empêchent la mise en oeuvre d'un

projet innovateur, menant ainsi à l'échec la réorganisation scolaire qui aurait découlé de cette expérience.

Dans le cadre des projets-pilotes des années de transition, ces dimensions doivent être examinées minutieusement. Le succès de ces projets dépende en grande partie des efforts déployés pour fournir aux intervenantes et aux intervenants les structures d'appui nécessaires pour mener à bien les projets.

Bibliographie

Anderson, S. et al. *Une étude de cas du Projet Excellence.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1989.

Boich, J. et C. Whitfield. *Current Programs for the Transition Years (Grades 7, 8 and 9).* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1990.

Fédération des enseignants de l'Ontario. *Politiques de la Fédération des enseignants de l'Ontario en matière de curriculum, 1983-1984.* Toronto. 1983.

Godbout, M. *Vers des structures scolaires stables et représentatives dans Prescott-Russell.* Gloucester. 1987.

Lalonde, G. et B. Kipp. *Rapport du comité mixte sur la gestion des écoles élémentaires et secondaires de langue française.* Toronto. 1982.

Ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. *L'éducation en français en Ontario aux paliers élémentaire et secondaire : examen des répercussions de la proposition sur le français langue minoritaire en Ontario présentée au conseil des ministres le 20 octobre 1977.* Toronto. 1983.

Park, P. et M. Fullan. *Curriculum Ontario 1986; question sur le perfectionnement professionnel.* Toronto : Fédération des enseignants de l'Ontario, comité des études en éducation. 1986.

14.
La participation de la collectivité

L'école, en général, ne limite pas ses rapports uniquement aux élèves qui la fréquentent. Elle entretient également des rapports avec la communauté environnante, c'est-à-dire, les parents et la collectivité en général. Le type de rapports établis aura sans aucun doute une influence sur le rendement scolaire des élèves et la qualité de vie qui existe à l'école (Fullan, 1985).

On peut aller plus loin en disant que les formes de communication existantes vont influencer également la participation des parents dans l'école. Un bon réseau de communication pourra avoir pour effet de susciter un intérêt plus grand de la part des parents, étant donné qu'ils seront mieux en mesure de comprendre le fonctionnement de l'école et, par le fait même, le fonctionnement de leurs propres enfants. En ce sens, la participation des parents devient donc une composante importante dans la réussite d'une expérience scolaire.

On ne saurait minimiser non plus le caractère communautaire de l'école en milieu minoritaire. De par sa situation particulière, l'école doit aussi miser sur la communauté qui l'entoure pour assurer sa survie. Souffrant d'inégalité en termes de nombre et de pouvoir, souvent éparpillée et manquant d'institutions fortes, la population franco-ontarienne se rassemble autour de l'école. Cette dernière regroupe donc une clientèle ayant un intérêt commun, celui de son épanouissement social, culturel et économique par le biais de l'éducation de langue française.

L'école a donc un rôle important à jouer dans le maintien de l'identité culturelle du groupe qu'elle dessert. Elle représente en effet le véhicule par excellence par lequel peuvent se transmettre les valeurs, la culture et les traditions d'une communauté ethnique, ici, de la communauté franco-ontarienne (Gérin-Lajoie, 1993). La communauté est donc appelée à s'impliquer dans tout ce qui touche l'éducation minoritaire de langue française, que ce soit au niveau de la gestion scolaire ou au niveau du fonctionnement de l'école.

En plus de remplir des fonctions de transmission de connaissances et de

socialisation, l'école en milieu minoritaire devient aussi une ressource culturelle pour la communauté qu'elle dessert (Frenette, 1988), c'est-à-dire, qu'elle possède le potentiel de constituer un milieu de vie. Comme l'a encore décrit Frenette (1988) « Ainsi l'institution est un puissant rappel à tous, y compris à la majorité, que la minorité existe et qu'elle a un avenir comme communauté ». Dans ce sens, le rôle de l'école en milieu minoritaire est différent de celui que joue l'école en milieu majoritaire.

La communauté franco-ontarienne compte aussi sur ses écoles pour ralentir le phénomène de l'assimilation (Frenette, 1988). En effet, les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes ont toujours eu à faire face à la menace de l'assimilation (Mougeon, 1984; Bernard, 1986). Avec l'accès des élèves à l'enseignement secondaire en langue française en 1968, on a pensé qu'il serait peut-être possible, sinon d'enrayer complètement l'assimilation, du moins de la ralentir considérablement. Mougeon (1984) a cependant démontré que tel n'est pas le cas et que le nombre de personnes qui avaient abandonné l'usage du français à la maison avait augmenté au fil des années, malgré l'accès à l'enseignement secondaire en langue française.

D'autres auteurs ont aussi proclamé que l'école ne suffit pas à enrayer l'assimilation et qu'il faut insister sur l'importance de la famille pour la sauvegarde de la langue française (Churchill et al., 1985; Desjarlais, 1983).

Néanmoins, il ne faut pas minimiser le rôle que l'école doit jouer dans une communauté minoritaire. Celle-ci peut en effet devenir un des piliers de la communauté (Fournier, 1989; Benoît et al., 1989; Thériault et Dumaine, 1989; Dubé, 1989), où vient, par exemple, s'ajouter à l'école un centre communautaire pour procurer à la population francophone toute la gamme des services requis par la communauté, soit, par exemple, des services de santé, une bibliothèque publique, une garderie, un centre d'alphabétisation, etc. De tels projets existent ailleurs dans le pays, au Nouveau-Brunswick, au Québec. D'autres sont en voie de développement comme à Terre-Neuve, en Nouvelle-Écosse et en Alberta. Pour leur part, les francophones de certaines régions de l'Ontario, comme London et Sault-Ste-Marie se sont déjà penchés sur la question. On semble donc intéressé à une utilisation maximale des ressources disponibles.

Mais peu importe l'utilisation qu'on veuille faire de l'école en milieu minoritaire, on s'entend pour dire qu'il faut accroître l'interaction entre celle-ci et la communauté et ce, à partir de l'école même. Pour ce faire, il faut assurer un financement adéquat de même que l'embauche de personnel approprié (Bourgeois, 1988).

De plus, l'accès aux ressources francophones de la communauté lié au développement de matériel pédagogique adapté aux besoins des élèves francophones pourrait favoriser un plus haut pourcentage de réussite scolaire chez ces derniers, en particulier en ce qui a trait à leur compétence communicative en français (Heller, 1987). L'auteure va plus loin en avançant que la collaboration entre l'école, les élèves et la communauté pourrait contribuer à diminuer le décrochage, phénomène très sérieux chez les jeunes franco-ontariens et les jeunes franco-ontariennes, ainsi que leur sous-représentation dans les domaines scientifiques.

Dans le cas qui nous intéresse ici, soit l'implication de la communauté en ce qui a trait aux années de transition, les écrits recensés n'y ont pas spécifiquement fait référence. Comme le notent Hargreaves et Earl (1990) en parlant de certaines recherches effectuées sur la communauté franco-ontarienne, ce groupe d'âge particulier n'a pas encore été étudié. Une série de questions se pose donc sur l'adaptation et la réussite de ces élèves lors de leur passage au secondaire et le rôle que la communauté devrait jouer dans ce processus.

Bibliographie

Benoît, L. et al. « L'école communautaire : remarques sur ses approches pédagogiques », dans *Éducation et francophonie : l'éducation communautaire.* Volume XVII. Numéro 3. Décembre 1989.

Bernard, R. « Le rôle social des institutions », dans *Revue du Nouvel-Ontario.* Numéro 8. 1986.

Bourgeois, P. *Pour un développement de la culture franco-ontarienne dans les écoles de langue française en Ontario.* Toronto : Association ontaroise des responsables d'animation culturelle. 1988.

Churchill, S. et al. *Éducation et besoins des Franco-Ontariens : le diagnostic d'un système d'éducation : Volume 1 : problèmes de l'ensemble du système: l'élémentaire et le secondaire.* Toronto : Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne.1985.

Desjarlais, L. *L'influence du milieu sociolinguistique sur les élèves franco-ontariens.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1983.

Dubé, M. « L'école communautaire; une réaction à l'urbanisation », dans *Éducation et francophonie : l'éducation communautaire.* Volume XVII. Numéro 3. Décembre 1989.

Fournier, J. T. « Les centres scolaires et communautaires : bilan et perspectives» dans *Éducation et francophonie : l'éducation communautaire.* Volume XVII. Numéro 3. Décembre 1989.

Frenette, N. « Les besoins de l'éducation en situation minoritaire », dans *La revue pédagogique du Conseil français de l'Alberta.* Volume XV. Numéro 3. Automne 1988.

Fullan, M. « Change processes and Strategies at the local level », dans *Elementary School Journal.* 1985.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. « L'éducation franco-ontarienne : un besoin pressant de changement », Communication présentée dans le cadre du congrès de l'ACFAS (association canadienne-française pour l'avancement de la science). Sherbrooke. Mai 1991.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. « Les programmes scolaires et l'éducation franco-ontarienne : la pédagogie critique comme moyen d'intervention », dans L. Cardinal (éd.) *Actes Express*, Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa, 1993 (sous presse).

Heller, M. « L'école de langue française à Toronto », dans *Revue du Nouvel-Ontario*. Numéro 9. 1987.

Mougeon, R. « Le maintien du français et les jeunes Franco-Ontariens », dans *Langue et Société*. Numéro 13. Printemps 1984.

Thériault, A. et F. Dumaine. « L'école communautaire : le génie de l'adaptation », dans *Éducation et francophonie : l'école communautaire*. Volume XVII. Numéro 3. Décembre 1989.

15.
Le programme de base

D'après les écrits recensés, il semble que peu d'efforts soient faits dans les écoles de langue française de l'Ontario pour tenter de refléter la réalité franco-ontarienne dans les programmes scolaires existants (Gérin-Lajoie, 1993; Cazabon et Frenette, 1980; Frenette, 1984; Churchill et al., 1985). En effet, au début des années 70, les programmes-cadres des écoles de langue française de l'Ontario étaient calqués sur ceux du Québec. À partir de la fin des années 70, ces programmes se sont inspirés des programmes-cadres de la clientèle anglophone (Frenette, 1984).

À présent, le ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario insiste, par l'entremise de ses programmes-cadres sur l'importance de l'enseignement en langue française et la promotion du français à travers les diverses matières enseignées à l'école, sans toutefois adapter ces programmes aux besoins de la clientèle visée.

Selon Gérin-Lajoie (1991), cette préoccupation concernant la langue semble avoir minimisé l'importance de l'élaboration de programmes scolaires qui soient adaptés aux besoins d'une clientèle minoritaire. Par conséquent, les programmes-cadres des écoles de langue française ne sont pas très différents de ceux des écoles de langue anglaise. Les principes directeurs du ministère de l'Éducation sont en effet assez similaires quelle que soit la langue d'instruction, à l'exception de quelques matières comme le Français, l'Histoire et les Sciences sociales, où l'on mentionne l'existence d'une minorité de langue française en Ontario.

Le programme-cadre de Français (1987) au niveau intermédiaire, par exemple, insiste sur l'importance de tenir compte de la réalité franco-ontarienne. L'emphase se place sur la langue d'instruction et sur l'importance pour les écoles de langue française de réussir à faire communiquer les élèves en français et non pas simplement leur faire apprendre le français. Comme on l'explique dans le programme-cadre, « ... l'école doit maintenant devenir l'endroit où l'élève utilise la langue, et non seulement le lieu où on la lui enseigne ».

D'autres matières, dont les mathématiques, ne sont que de simples traductions

des programmes-cadres de langue anglaise. Très peu de directions sont données aux enseignantes et aux enseignants en ce qui concerne l'élaboration et l'utilisation d'un matériel qui soit mieux adapté aux besoins des élèves franco-ontariens, à savoir que ce dernier réflète leur réalité.

Une recherche effectuée en 1989 par Anderson et al. sur un projet d'enseignement individualisé dans une école secondaire mixte du nord de l'Ontario a amené la responsable de l'étude des programmes en français à se pencher sur les programmes-cadres du Ministère et leur utilisation dans cette école. Un volet de l'étude a donc consisté à faire une étude approfondie d'un échantillon de matériel didactique utilisé par les élèves inscrits aux cours enseignés en français. Entre autres, une analyse de contenu du cours de Français au niveau fondamental a été effectuée. Les résultats ont démontré que la réalité franco-ontarienne n'y est aucunement dépeinte, alors que le programme-cadre mentionne cette réalité.

De leur côté, Canale et al. (1987) mentionnent, qu'à cause de la présence d'anglo-dominants dans les écoles de langue française de la province, les programmes dans ces écoles devraient être conçus pour des élèves ayant des compétences inégales en français. Présentement, les programmes ne tiennent pas compte de ces différences. Les auteurs ont créé une trousse qui a pour but d'aider les éducateurs et les éducatrices à identifier, mettre en place et évaluer le ou les programmes qui, selon les contraintes locales, pourraient apporter un élément de réponse à la présence des élèves anglo-dominants dans les écoles de langue française, sans pénaliser les élèves francophones.

Cazabon et Frenette (1980) avaient d'ailleurs déjà souligné les besoins totalement différents des deux clientèles que l'on retrouve dans les écoles de langue française et qu'il serait important de tenir compte au niveau des programmes scolaires, du matériel pédagogique, des méthodes d'enseignement et de la formation des enseignantes et des enseignants. Il serait donc souhaitable de diversifier les pratiques pédagogiques (Frenette, 1988).

Concernant la quantité et la pertinence du matériel pédagogique adapté aux besoins des élèves franco-ontariens disponible, Hargreaves et Earl (1990) ont déjà noté que :

« L'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario (1983) a insisté sur l'insuffisance du matériel pédagogique sous forme imprimée et audio-visuelle dans les écoles franco-ontariennes. Heller et al. (1988) font le tour du problème dans les écoles franco-ontariennes lorsqu'ils font remarquer que les livres en provenance du Québec ne conviennent souvent pas au programme d'études de l'Ontario et aux élèves franco-ontariens et que les livres traduits de l'anglais ne sont pas adaptés à la culture des Franco-ontariens » (p.243) [1]

Le gouvernement de l'Ontario (1990) a d'ailleurs tenté de palier à ce manque en instituant un programme de subvention appelé « Fonds de langue française » pour la création de matériel pédagogique adapté aux besoins des francophones de la province.

Néanmoins, on ne peut pas nier l'existence d'un certain matériel pédagogique. Par exemple, le Centre franco-ontarien de ressources pédagogiques, situé à Ottawa, publie régulièrement du matériel scolaire pour les paliers élémentaire et secondaire. Heller et al. (1987) ont développé du matériel pédagogique adapté à la clientèle des écoles de langue française de la province. Le projet «Coopération et découverte» est constitué de modules d'activités d'apprentissage basées sur la méthode de l'apprentissage coopératif et sur l'ethnographie de la communication. L'emphase est mise sur l'enseignement de la langue en tant que matière et l'usage de la langue à travers le programme en entier, ainsi que sur la création de liens avec la communauté. L'élaboration de ce matériel fut suivie par un projet de formation en cours d'emploi pour les enseignantes et les enseignants impliqués dans le projet, composante essentielle de toute mise en oeuvre de programme.

Comme on peut le constater, la présente recension des écrits montre que les recherches effectuées sur les programmes scolaires n'ont pas porté spécifiquement sur les années de transition, bien que dans certaines d'entre elles on mentionne

---

[1] Hargreaves, A., et L. Earl. *Droits de passage: analyse de travaux de recherche choisis sur l'enseignement des années de transition*. Toronto: ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1990.

cette clientèle. Il n'en demeure pas moins que ces études peuvent être utilisées à titre d'exemples, afin de mieux comprendre la réalité franco-ontarienne.

Bibliographie

Anderson, S. et al. *Une étude de cas du Projet Excellence.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation. 1989.

Canale, M. et al. *Programmes dans les écoles élémentaires de langue française pour les élèves de compétence inégale en français.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1987.

Cazabon, B. et N. Frenette. *Le français parlé en situation minoritaire : Volume II : l'enseignement , les programmes et la formation des maîtres dans les écoles de langue française des communautés franco-ontariennes minoritaires.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation et ministère des Collèges et Universités. 1980.

Churchill, S. et al. *Éducation et besoins des Franco-ontariens : le diagnostic d'un système d'éducation : Volume 1 : problèmes de l'ensemble du système: l'élémentaire et le secondaire.* Toronto : Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne. 1985.

Frenette, N. « Histoire des programmes-cadres français, langue maternelle en Ontario », dans *L'expression de soi : Actes du congrès de l'AOPF,* sous la direction de G. Gervais et B. Cazabon. 1984.

Frenette, N. « Les besoins de l'éducation en milieu minoritaire », dans *Échanges.* 16 (3) . Automne 1988.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. « L'éducation franco-ontarienne: un besoin pressant de changement ». Communication présentée dans le cadre du Congrès de l'ACFAS (association canadienne-française pour l'avancement de la science) . Sherbrooke. Mai 1991.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. « Les programmes scolaires et l'éducation franco-ontarienne : la pédagogie critique comme moyen d'intervention », dans L. Cardinal (éd.) *Actes Express,* Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa, 1993 (sous presse).

Hargreaves, A. et L. Earl. *Droits de passage : analyse des travaux de recherche choisis sur l'enseignement des années de transition.* Toronto : ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. 1990.

Heller, M. et al. *Projet Coopération et découverte.* Toronto : CREFO, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario. 1990.

Ministère de l'Éducation de l'Ontario. *Fonds de langue française (matériel didactique) : élaboration et production de matériel didactique.* Toronto. 1990.

Printed on recycled paper